Class 937.42 Book B63
Columbia College Library
Madison Av. and 49th St. New York.
Given by Rev. W. B. Bolmer
Beside the main topic this book also treats of
Subject No. On page | Subject No. On page

With the author's compliments.

THE

CHURCH AND THE FAITH

A PHILOSOPHICAL HISTORY OF THE
CATHOLIC CHURCH

CONTAINING A THEORY OF THE CHURCH, AN ACCOUNT OF ITS ESTABLISHMENT, ESSAYS ON THE SIX GENERAL COUNCILS AND IMPORTANT CONTROVERSIES, AN EXPOSITION AND DEFENSE OF THE DUE AND PROPER CLAIMS OF THE CHURCH IN AMERICA, AND OTHER MATTERS

BY THE REV.
WILLIAM BREVOORT BOLMER

NEW YORK
E. & J. B. YOUNG & CO
COOPER UNION, FOURTH AVENUE
1887

Copyright, 1887.
E. & J. B. Young & Co.

DEDICATION.

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND

HUGH MILLER THOMPSON, S.T.D., LL.D.,

WHOSE ABLE INSTRUCTION TAUGHT HIM TO SEEK FOR THE HIDDEN MEANING WHICH UNDERLIES THE EVENTS OF HISTORY, TO EXAMINE THE EVIDENCE OF HISTORIANS WITH A CRITICAL EYE, AND TO ACCEPT A RATIONAL THEORY OF DOCTRINAL DEVELOPMENT;

WHOSE WISE FORESIGHT AND TEMPERATE COURAGE HAVE POINTED OUT FOR HIM AND OTHERS THE SAFE PATH THROUGH AT LEAST ONE VEHEMENT CONTROVERSY OF MODERN DATE;

AND WHOSE MANLY ELOQUENCE HAS HELD BEFORE HIM AND VAST CONGREGATIONS A SHINING EXAMPLE AND MODEL OF THE TRUE PULPIT ORATOR;

THE FOLLOWING VOLUME IS GRATEFULLY DEDICATED BY THE AUTHOR, IN THE HOPE THAT NO CAUSE OF OFFENSE WILL MEET THE KEEN EYE OF HIS FORMER PRECEPTOR, SHOULD CURIOSITY PROMPT SO BUSY A DIVINE TO TURN THESE PAGES, AND EXAMINE THE QUALITY OF THE FRUIT FOR WHICH THE SKILL AND PATIENT FAITHFULNESS OF THE LEARNED DOCTOR ARE IN A MEASURE RESPONSIBLE.

THE AUTHOR.

T8130

PREFACE.

It is believed that a very definite aim, as the purpose of the present publication, will manifest itself to every attentive reader who has the patience to peruse it to the end. It may not be superfluous, however, to state that the author was conscious of a twofold design, while laboring at his manuscript. Having often wished, in vain, for some single book which should present in a small compass, for the benefit of such as he has been preparing for confirmation, the exact nature of some of the main reasons which, in his judgment, should actuate every one who seeks to become a member of the church at whose altars he unworthily ministers, he intends to employ the present volume for the instruction of his own candidates; and offers it to the public in the hope that it may prove useful to others in a similar way. He also begs leave to say that he is thoroughly persuaded that the work contains an argument which is as important as it is uncommon; that, for himself, he holds to the correctness of the position assumed, and expects to die in that belief, as he has always lived in it since he became old enough to form an intelligent judgment in the premises; and that he has made an attempt to set forth his views, knowing them to be unpopular, because he has felt constrained to take that step by that strange necessity of strenuously advocating his peculiar ideas which lies so heavily upon most men of decided convictions, in whose ranks the author would shrink from claiming for himself a place, did not the exigencies of his period seem to exact such a sacrifice from his diffidence.

Ten years have sped on their way since this work was composed. Revising it carefully, after such an interval, and after several years in which it was not even glanced at, the writer has, of course, found somewhat to be changed, but he is surprised at the small amount of really important alterations he has been led to make. The positions assumed he regards as defensible; and, relying upon the divine assistance, he is ready to maintain them against all assailants. Should he presently become convinced that any one of them is untenable, he will cheerfully seek, and diligently fortify, other ground, thankful for whatever agency shall have delivered him from so much of error. As, however, a whole decade has strengthened his persuasion that the teachings of this humble production are substantially those of nineteen Christian centuries, he is emboldened to commit these chapters to discriminating, well-informed, and enlightened readers with a certain degree of hopeful confidence that his extremely pleasant, though arduous, labor will not have been wasted.

THE AUTHOR.

December 1*st*, 1886.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

IMPORTANCE OF THE SUBJECT.

PAGE

Forms of government not unimportant, in particular forms of church government—Possibility of being more or less happy in heaven according to one's life on earth—All sects tend towards deterioration—The church the only hope of the world at large—Christ's Church dear to all who love Him 11

CHAPTER II.

THEORY OF THE CHURCH.

Two theories, Monarchical and Republican—A model government not yet realized—Objections to a democracy—No form of government imposed upon us by Reason—God absolute Monarch of the universe—Danger of Centralization—Of License—The Church the champion of Freedom—To whom was the commission to rule Christ's Kingdom given?—The Apostles communicated the Holy Ghost to the baptized—Commission to the Apostles alone—Our method of reasoning vindicated—The functions of the laity in the Christian Republic—This Republic a Monarchy also, governed by Christ through commissioned officers—The Apostolic Succession valueless out of the true Communion..... 19

CHAPTER III.

EPISCOPACY.

The Episcopal Theory satisfies the requirements of Scripture—The Papal Supremacy a fiction—The Church episcopal in second century—Universally—No trace of any previous change—Must have been so in the beginning—Likelihood of ambitious presbyters snatching the mitre—

PAGE

Theory of a gradual, unrecorded usurpation subversive of the entire Faith—Reason of adoption of usurpation theory—Anti-episcopacy untenable 31

CHAPTER IV.

CONTINUITY AND RISE OF THE CHURCH.

The Christian Church a continuation of the Jewish—The Holy Spirit not given till Pentecost—Jewish ceremonies tolerated for awhile, but swept away at last by the destruction of Jerusalem—Rapidity of growth considered as a criterion of the doctrine taught by a sect—Natural causes insufficient to account for rapid advance of Christianity—Hatred of Jews for a *suffering* Messiah—Of Gentiles for a Crucified God—Of sinful man for goodness and truth—Christianity triumphant through coöperation of the Holy Spirit—The *natural causes* which, working with the divine agency, produced such speedy and solid progress in the early days of the Church were, 1st. Its admirable organization—2nd. Its unity ; 3rd. Its purity 41

CHAPTER V.

MANICHÆISM.

Early sects—Gnosticism—Manichæism—Origin of evil—Consequences of Dualistic theory; Monachism—Puritanism—Brethren of Free Spirit—Calvinism—Universalism—Rejection of Old Testament 55

CHAPTER VI.

THE CHURCH AS AN ESTABLISHMENT.

Conversion of the world—Of Constantine—Edict of Milan—Glorious prospect before the Church—An Establishment unjust—Dangers of such a status to the Church—Imperial intermeddling in matters of faith—Aggrandizement of ministry—Evils arising with growth of Episcopal importance—1st. Deterioration of character—2nd. Elevation of unworthy men—Investiture Controversy—Bad results of Establishment .. 63

CHAPTER VII.

THEORY OF GENERAL COUNCILS.

The Saviour as a Teacher—Taught a *system* of the most perfect kind—Disciples needed one of another sort—A system necessary in all learning and teaching—St. Paul as a systematizer—Objections must be met by

PAGE

definite replies—Religion obedient to this law—One must philosophize in order to reflect—Impossible to instruct the ignorant without formulæ—Opposition to Dogmatic Theology comes from repugnance to Christianity, from love of peace, from mental incapacity, from inherited prejudice—From arrogant way in which it has been taught—Analogy demands that we should not be left to the task of weighing authorities in order to ascertain the Truth—A safer way provided—Voice of the Spirit to be sought for in the utterances of the whole church—Initiative in determining controversies belongs to the ministry—Laity must have at least the power of veto—Ministry a caste—Most exposed to governmental influence—Not as conservative as the laity—No council can *à priori* be pronounced General—Absolute unanimity not requisite—Council not to pronounce what the Faith ought to be, but what it always has been—Must, however, be allowed a certain liberty in drawing plain deductions and deciding upon propriety of forms—Tradition—Development..... 74

CHAPTER VIII.

COUNCIL OF NICÆA, 325 A. D.

Alexandria—Its school—Its speculative tendency—Dispute between Alexander and Arius—Arianism—Its terrible and sweeping consequences—Constantine interposes—Members of the Council of Nicæa—Hosius—Eusebius—Eustathius—Athanasius—His life—His importance to the Church—A remarkable synod—Transactions at its sessions—Discussion of the Homoöusion—The controversy not an unimportant one—The reasonableness of the Catholic doctrine—The Monarchy of the Father—Decisions of the Council—Subsequent history of the struggle—Constantine and Arius—Constantius—His successors and their policies—Rise of Aëtians and Semi-Arians—Arianism vanishes..... 95

CHAPTER IX.

FIRST COUNCIL OF CONSTANTINOPLE, 381 A. D.

Anecdote of Amphilochius—Macedonius and Macedonianism—Apollinarianism and its founder—How far Apollinarius was responsible for the heresy which took his name—Necessity for a General Council—Times inauspicious—Sad effects of alliance between Church and State in deterioration of the former—Damaging influence upon morals of unintermitted controversy and strife—Council called—Constantinople—Theodosius the Great—His religious policy—Success of his arms—Constitution and conduct of Councils—Excuse for unruliness of ancient gatherings to be sought in the lack of Parliamentary Manuals—Gregory Nazianzen—Action of the Council—Œcumenicity of Council—Division of the Church into Greek and Latin Churches—Difference between Greek and Roman tongues—They are established with corre-

PAGE
sponding diversity of civilization in East and West respectively—Greeks degenerate in Asia—Greek the great language of theology—The Romans morally superior—Staunch and conservative—Œcumenicity of 1st Constantinople proved by universal reception of its Creed..... 125

CHAPTER X.

COUNCIL OF EPHESUS, 431 A. D.

Antioch and its school—Antagonism between Alexandria and Asia—Cyril—View of the Incarnation taken by Theodore of Mopsuestia—Nestorius patriarch of Constantinople—Accused by Eusebius of Dorylæum—Use of term *Theotokos*—Its correctness—Reference to Rome of the dispute by both parties, Cyril and Nestorius—Growing importance of Rome—Celestine favorable to Cyril—Theodosius the Younger—Ephesus—Assembling of the bishops—Proceedings—Counter-proceedings of John and his adherents—Imperial countenance obtained by Cyril's party—Character of the Council—Question of authoritativeness not bound up with that of orderliness—End of the session—Reconciliation of principal disputants—Further history of Nestorianism—Church right in strenuously asserting the *Theotokos*—Decline of the heresy—Pelagianism—Pelagius—St. Augustine—His history, conversion, writings—Radical defect in philosophy of both Pelagius and Augustine—Man a free agent—His power a limited one—Reconciliation of contradiction—Rise of Pelagianism—History of the new doctrine—Zosimus of Rome at first approves and then condemns it—Ephesus pronounces its condemnation—Semipelagianism—Statement of view of man's freedom held by Pelagius—By Augustine—True theory that of coöperation—Discussion of Foreknowledge—Views concerning Adam—The Fall—Original Sin—Redemption—Regeneration—Decisions of Council of Ephesus—The Catholic doctrine of Election..... 147

CHAPTER XI.

COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON, 451 A. D.

The monastic orders—The papacy—Their rivalry, and that of Alexandria and Constantinople—Dioscorus—Eutyches accused—Robber Synod—Nature of Eutychianism—Difficulties attending attempts to conceive of the union without fusion of the two natures—Commingling of natures destructive of doctrine of Mediatorship—Death of Theodosius, accession of Pulcheria, and her marriage with Marcian—Policy of government with regard to the holding of a council—Place and composition of Fourth General Council—Its proceedings—Case of Theodoret—Reluctance to issue definitions of the Faith—Condemnation of Eutychianism and affirmation that Christ exists "in two natures"—Cyril's orthodoxy discussed—Definition of Chalcedon justified—Ratification of three preceding General Councils—Advantages arising from this ratifi-

PAGE
cation—Chalcedon completes the defense and statement of doctrine of Incarnation—Church proof against natural tendency towards extreme views—History of Alexandrian church—Disturbances in Palestine—Leo's Encyclical—Zeno's Henoticon—Schism of Rome and Constantinople—Later history of Eutychians, or *Jacobites* 191

CHAPTER XII.

SECOND COUNCIL OF CONSTANTINOPLE, 553 A. D.

Completeness of doctrinal system formulated by first four councils—Fifth and Sixth not unnecessary—Propriety of Justinian's scheme for settling faith by corresponding with the bishops instead of summoning them to a conclave—Theodore Ascidas excites a controversy about certain writings in order to draw off attention from Origenism—The errors of Theodore, Theodoret, and Ibas collected into Three Chapters, and condemned by Imperial Edict, 544, as favoring Nestorianism—The condemned authors—Justinian—Edict endorsed—Resistance of North-African Church—Of Vigilius, and Dalmatian and Illyrian bishops—Vigilius at Constantinople—Noted opponents—Africans mistaken as to action of Chalcedon with regard to writings of Theodoret and Ibas—Objection advanced by them to condemnation of dead men not valid—Fifth General Council—Ratification of its action—Plea for its authoritativeness 216

CHAPTER XIII.

THIRD COUNCIL OF CONSTANTINOPLE, 680–681 A. D.

Imperial contempt for theological controversy—Successive compromises—Their results—The Monothelite compromise—Its origin—Why Will was selected—Discussion of the new doctrine—Problem of contact—Heraclius—Rise of Monothelism—Sophronius—"Ecthesis" (639)—Constans II.—Maximus—"Type" (648)—Opposition—Stephen of Dor—Maximus—Martin I.—Persecution and death of last—Of Maximus—Anastasius—Martyrs had not suffered in vain—Adeodatus excommunicates Patriarch of Constantinople—Donus—Agatho summons synod which condemns the heresy—Constantine Poganatus calls the Sixth General Council—Its proceedings—Remarkable episode—Decision of Council—Honorius of Rome anathematized—Further history of struggle, and downfall of Monothelism—Maronites 233

CHAPTER XIV.

ICONOCLASTIC CONTROVERSY.

Certain controversies instrumental in dividing the Church—Judaism and idols—Early Christians denounce science—And art—Christianity not

PAGE
hostile to Love of Beautiful—Art gains a foot-hold—Danger attending pictures and images—Idolatry enervating to soul of worshiper—Effeminacy the origin of idolatry in the Church—A reäction to be expected—Mahommedanism and Judaism deride the idols of Christians—Leo the Isaurian—Attacks images—Rouses the monks of the Archipelago—Opposition—Germanus resigns see of Constantinople—Italy rejects the edict—John Damascenus—Constantine V., Copronymus—Convenes Council at Constantinople, 754, and condemns images—Irritates the partisans of images—Severe and cruel treatment of patriarch of Constantinople—Leo IV. emperor—Irene—Council of Nicæa (787) restores images—Leo the Armenian a vehement Iconoclast (813–820)—Theodore Studites—Michael II.—Theophilus—Theodora ejects John the Grammarian, reïnstates images, and institutes the Feast of Orthodoxy—Charlemagne—The Four Caroline Books—The middle course—Charlemagne rebukes both parties—Council at Frankfort in 794—Lewis the Pious—Britain unites with France—Fair prospect clouded..... 255

CHAPTER XV.

SCHISM OF EAST AND WEST.

The scene at Babel reënacted—No doctrine binding, however generally held, unless sanctioned by a council—Providence makes assembling of a general council impossible—Unity not destroyed by the Schism—Great injury, nevertheless, results—Causes of disruption—Moral or theological—Natural—Union with State—Minor causes—Iconoclastic controversy—"Filioque"—Grounds of objection raised by the Greeks to insertion of that clause—Unauthorized—Impugns Monarchy of the Father—History of Schism—Nicholas I.—Photius—Mutual excommunication—Attempt at reünion in Eleventh Century—In Thirteenth—In Fifteenth—Total failure—End of Byzantine Empire..... 280

CHAPTER XVI.

EUCHARISTIC CONTROVERSY.

The Frankish race takes a leading position in the Church—Iconoclastic Controversy trenches upon doctrine of Eucharist—First Eucharistic Controversy—Doctrine of Paschasius Radbert—Opponents—Supporters—Discussion of Doctrine—Testimony of senses to be taken unreservedly or not at all—They testify against corporeal change—Christ's manhood is in heaven—We partake not of glorified, but of crucified, body—Position thus reached must be maintained at all hazards—On the other hand, Christ is present in Eucharist specially by His divinity—By His Vicar, the Holy Spirit—In a closer and mystical sense which we cannot understand—Nothing gained by theory of carnal presence—Our theory not tending to debase the Sacrament—Scholasticism—Weakness of Beren-

PAGE
garius—He comes upon the stage—Advanced views which have become unpopular—He twice recants, and dies—Substance and Accidents—Transubstantiation and its consequences..... 298

CHAPTER XVII.

LATIN CHURCH TO THE TRIDENTINE ERA.

Pristine glory and sad decline of Rome—The wretched character of many popes—General deterioration of the ministry—Moral tendency of certain false doctrines—Rome *estopped* from denying these charges—Palliating circumstance to be found in universality of degeneracy—Probably painted as more thorough than it really was—Doctrinal condition of Latin Church—Its status as an organization—Council of Trent (1545–1563)—Causes of hatred between Romanists and Protestants—A plea for charity and justice..... 315

CHAPTER XVIII.

CONTINENTAL REFORMATION.

Luther—Real question before us regarding Lutheranism—Doctrine of Private Judgment—The Lutheran Body not a Church—Lay-baptism—Position of English Reformers upon this question—Consideration of the plea that the Lutheran and Reformed communions have prospered so greatly—Calvinism—Closing reflection..... 331

CHAPTER XIX.

ENGLISH CHURCH.

Settlement and early history of England—Its conversion—Augustine—Columba—Roman interest gradually predominates—The Danes—Normans—Henry II.—Magna Charta—Robert of Lincoln—Wycliffe—The English Church submissive to the Papacy—Henry VIII.—Erastianism—English independence—Henry not the cause of the English reformation—His tyranny injurious to it—Defense of Henry, as acting according to law—As having been right in annulling an incestuous marriage—The one great impediment to reform lay in the doctrine of Papal Supremacy—This obstruction brought to light—Caution and reverence in revising doctrine—Gradual emancipation from Transubstantiation—Other errors fall along with this—Influence of Continental Reformers—Reformation not perfect—The *Church* question as viewed by Cranmer and others—We are justified in regarding it differently—The English liturgies—Articles of religion necessary—The various series—Continuity of organization—English reformation not an accident—Difference between destruction and renovation—Trials of the Church—Her preservation..... 340

CHAPTER XX.

AMERICAN CHURCH.

PAGE

Colonization of America—Independence achieved—Material progress—Lack of Conservatism a national fault—Supplied by the Church—Puritanism—American Church a free one—Long deprived of bishops—These obtained at last—The daughter church does not cease to be a branch of the Catholic Communion—Woful condition of colonial church—Sad results—Saved by sound theology of the English divines—Her present condition—True policy—Her hope..... 373

THE CHURCH AND THE FAITH.

CHAPTER I.

IMPORTANCE OF THE SUBJECT.

The temper of the age is to take little account of the claims advanced by conflicting sects, or even by rival religions. So extremely tolerant have we become that we care little to ask whether, indeed, a fellow-man has any religion at all. The old contentions which drowned nations in blood about differences of creed excite in the most of us no emotions whatever but those of wonder that reasonable beings should ever have engaged in them, and of pity, not unmingled with contempt, for the moral condition which made it possible to become excited upon such themes as gave rise to them. Most of all have we agreed that the belonging to this denomination, or that, or to any at all, is a matter of no importance whatsoever. In this respect the Christian world has greatly changed, not only since the Sixteenth Century, but since those early ages of the Faith to which some still look back with so much reverence, which indeed none who believe in the Bible can afford to despise. Time was when it was very generally held that there was absolutely no salvation outside of the one, holy, catholic and apostolic church; and that was when the men had not yet been taken from earth who had been taught by the living voice of the Saviour; and though we should conclude that this very general opinion of the early Christians was a mistake growing out of the engrafting of a false philosophy upon the pure teachings of Christ, yet we would be obliged to admit that the mistake was not only a very natural one to men strongly tinctured with the exclusiveness of Judaism and fired with the fervor of converts in the youth of a religion, but also a very pardonable one

to students of the New Testament when criticism had not yet learned to be as dispassionate as it has now become, seeing that the very commission which sent out the heralds of the Gospel upon that glorious, but most arduous and perilous, service of preaching Jesus and the Resurrection to all nations, was accompanied with the awful announcement that those who should reject their message would be *condemned;* and what could that mean but *condemned* at the final judgment? Nor will sound philosophy warrant the application of a different rule to religion from that to which everything else is found to conform. Herbert Spencer has doubtless done a good service to the world in emphasizing the truth that governments, by attempting to do too much, seriously interfere with the beneficial workings of natural laws; and by that very argument strengthens the position maintained by the vast majority of intelligent and thoughtful men that the happiness and misery, the prosperity and declension, of nations depend largely upon the character of the institutions under which they live. It is rather late to claim that humanity owes nothing to the mighty efforts of the old Roman legislators. Most of us would be rather impatient of the thesis that the rule of the Turk is as advantageous as that of the Queen of Great Britain, or even that there is any other form of government whatever the substitution of which for our own ought to be contemplated with indifference. Vast sums of money are being expended, huge outlays of time made, incalculable effort directed, and immense interest lavished each year, in every civilized nation, upon legislation; and when it comes to amending constitutions, that is hedged about with such safeguards that it certainly looks as though mankind at large were persuaded of the importance of these things, as though they were decidedly of opinion that good laws are better than bad ones, and a sound constitution preferable to a defective one. It is not easy to see how institutions, systems, organizations, political and social in character, can be of so much moment, and those religious in character of none at all; unless, indeed, religion itself is, as so many seem to be convinced, of no consequence. The organization of the stellar universe is of importance; the organization of the human being is of importance; the organization of the political fabric is of importance; and therefore we may not rashly conclude that the organization of men as religious beings is not of extremely grave importance also.

We have, it is true, come to see that men cannot be condemned for what is not their fault, that heathen who have had no opportunity of learning about the Christ cannot be cast away by a just Deity because they do not believe in Him. It is perfectly evident to us of this generation that every man who strives to do the best he can under the circumstances of his life must be commended and accepted, for having obeyed the law which he found written within him, or at least having tried hard and perseveringly to obey it, by the God who so loved us that He sent His only-begotten Son to take away the sins of the world. It is also axiomatic, or nearly so, that we are bound to recognize the Fruits of the Spirit wherever we find them, without distinction of creed or sect, and to regard those as true followers of the Lamb whom we see to be such. Do then these two self-evident propositions, that a man must be commended for doing as well as he can, and that the presence of the Holy Spirit must be acknowledged where the proper tokens are seen, lead to the conclusion that the Church question is devoid of significance?

That a man should be admitted into heaven is not all, for even if all are admitted into the same heaven and then are surrounded in all respects by the same environment, that no more insures an equality of enjoyment than a similar identity of treatment would on earth. Place a savage in a palace, plunge a sybarite in a boundless forest overrun with game, and neither is likely to thank you for his fate. So long as individuals are individuals they are what they are, and what they are is largely the product of their life history. Every servant may receive the same coin of wages in that he is admitted into bliss, and yet one rule over ten cities and another over five. A saint does not leave his character behind when he ascends the skies, but carries with him a certain definite capacity of enjoyment. He must be dull-spirited who does not see how great the differences are in point of ability to engage in worship. One person dies who has acquired the habit of close communion with God, and to whom ecstatic states of devotion are by no means unfamiliar; and another departs this life who has done little more than barely tolerate exercises of public, family, and private devotion, perhaps punctiliously complying with the forms but throwing no heart into the worship: is it conceivable that the latter should be as happy as the former in the presence of the God whom they have approached so differently? Or com-

pare two persons, one of whom has been taught in his youth to entertain the loftiest conceptions of the Triune God and to adore Him in all the beauty of holiness with all the helps afforded by the grandest services, and the other has groped blindly after the ideal of his soul and struggled all his life against the depressing influences of early prejudices and degrading superstitions, knowing that God is, and striving earnestly to find Him, crying aloud to some One and hardly distinguishing Him from a thousand idols that his forefathers have made for themselves: can we suppose that death places them upon an equality so that the one is as capable of entering into the sublime praises of God as the other? Whether, then, it be allowable to conjecture the existence, in addition to the "Jerusalem which is above," of heavenly Cesareas, Antiochs, Romes, Alexandrias, as homes for those who have not enjoyed the advantages of God's holy Church on earth, it plainly does not follow, from the impossibility of believing that a man will be eternally lost merely because he died in ignorance of Christianity, that it is not well worth our while to preach and teach Christianity to the heathen.

Then, as regards the second proposition, could it be demonstrated, notwithstanding the extreme difficulty of gauging the relative spirituality of different persons, that there is truth in the common assertion that equally good persons are nurtured under all Christian creeds, this would only show that the Almighty's hand is not tied up by His own ordinances, but that, while He chooses to set metes and bounds to His customary workings, He sometimes sees fit to transcend these self-imposed limitations and to bestow His grace otherwise than He has by promise obligated Himself to do. A whole nation, or even the great majority of an entire generation, might, for all we know to the contrary, be in such an abnormal condition that the Lord might judge it expedient to treat the members of it almost as if they actually belonged to His Church, whereas the real truth were that they did not so belong. There might be good reasons, nevertheless, for maintaining the distinctive features of the Church, whether these reasons should be evident to people in general, or not. The story of the many sects which at different periods, since the Son of Man withdrew His visible presence from earth, have sprung into being with more or less vehement claim to be the truest embodiment of discipleship, teaches us not to be hasty in judging that a new denomi-

nation is all that it wishes us to believe that it is. A tree is known by its fruits, to be sure, but the excellence of those first gathered may be sought in vain upon the twigs of the second year. Science instructs us that varieties improved by cultivation tend to revert to the original and greatly inferior type: in nothing is this law more unvarying than in the progress of religious societies. The new doctrine may brave with impunity the attacks of logic, and submit with equal assurance to the inspection which the naturally religious heart brings to bear upon everything which comes within its field of vision; it may proudly point to vast companies of men and women who have been trained by its influence into loftiness of soul and correctness of life; it may even adduce many proofs that Providence is enlisted upon its side, gathered from apparent interpositions in its behalf; and yet this fair exterior may cover much which God discerns very plainly, though man suspect not its presence then, nor discover it till generations have afforded scope for its complete development. Alas! universally do we trace this tendency to deteriorate; in church and sect alike does the discerning eye perceive it. As in man, so in every religious organization good and evil wage internecine strife for the mastery, and temporarily at least evil often gains the upper hand; then woe to the organization! Sweeping a rapid glance over all the countries that have ever been called Christian, and then narrowing our view to the great, if small, continent of Europe, there singling out nation by nation for the purpose of scanning its religious history, and perhaps pausing at last, not without silent lament, upon the wreck of old Father Tiber's Pride, let us honestly say whether the deplorable drift is not everywhere discernible. How then shall good eventually triumph? The reply is not unheard: Let everything go on, let religion clash with religion, sect vie with sect, church emulate church, each modifying and gradually ameliorating the other, and all slowly welding themselves together into the great Church of the Future. A hopeful theory. As nation undergoes attrition with nation, each rounding off the other, one borrowing its neighbor's inventions and improvements, and repaying them in kind and with interest, and all Europe the while steadily marching forward in civilization, so shall it be with churches. Is Christianity, then, an outgrowth of civilization, a development of religious instinct, and not a divine revelation? If so, it may be left, as civilization

is measurably left, to take care of itself; but if it be indeed beyond man's inventive power, a something sent down from heaven to meet an urgent human need, what chance is there that it will survive the rude handling it is sure to receive, unless the same gracious Being who gave it to an unappreciative world shall mercifully continue to foster it? The Church is here, like her Lord, for no selfish purpose. She exists for a world-wide purpose,—to witness for God to all the earth, and her influence penetrates into the remotest and most hidden corners of both hemispheres where men name the name of Christ. Upon the Church of God's own building, wherever and whatever that Church be, must depend the hopes of a struggling, groaning, sorely-afflicted Christendom. Standing amid the surging billows a rock-based beacon, her light flashing far across the deep at least serves to warn such vessels as with dragging anchors are drifting away from safe moorage. Extinguish that one steadfast gleam, and how long would it be till the whole fleet should have lost itself in the trackless expanse of doubt, ignorance, and sin?

If there be, as all, in some sense, who believe in the Bible, must confess there is, such a Church, it cannot without manifest irreverence be asserted or implied that this Church is very similar to, hardly distinguishable from, a railroad meeting no public demand, opening up no valuable tract of land, affording a market for no considerable amount of produce, but just laid out and completed by some wasteful capitalist to gratify an unaccountable impulse; for, with all solemnity be it said, how can we justify the expenditure of labor and care by our Saviour in constructing a road to heaven, if when made it is found no more secure, no better in any way, than a thousand others which all conduct to the same destination?

We may not severely blame any age for thinking that the millennium is near, but we are not obliged to adopt that theory ourselves. Great as may be our present attainments, they probably are not as great as men are capable of reaching, nor even by any means as perfect as they should be, taking into consideration the length of our spiritual genealogies and the evident rule that each generation ought to be better than the preceding one. It is to be feared that much of our common Christianity is merely nominal. There are vast numbers of people among us who are unaffected by Christianity, and not a few who stand hostilely dis-

posed towards it. A pure and unmitigated paganism burst forth in the French Revolution, and surges up to the surface at times now. The very alphabet of our religion seems to be unknown to agitators for social and political reforms. Fashion invades the churches. Money for charitable and pious uses is not so much given to the Lord, as it is extorted by methods which are really not much more effective than they are commendable. The observance of Sunday threatens to become obsolete. The practice of family worship is thought to be dying out. In short, there is much in our modern Christianity which might experience a change to the great advantage of us all. A religion which does not in the long run advance, can hardly be the true one, for it can hardly be alive. Each succeeding generation should not only be better instructed in divine things, but should inherit natures made more spiritual by the upward struggles of the parents, every such struggle working its way as a formative and permanent element into the character. How dare we doubt the future? Surely we have not reached the climax of spirituality attainable on earth, and just as surely the religious standard is bound to advance till that is reached, unless we have entirely misunderstood the teachings of the centuries. That a better grasp of the doctrine of the Church will not play a prominent part in bringing to a realization what we thus hope and long for, few would be rash enough to affirm. Other doctrines possess superior dignity; it is, for instance, more important to believe rightly concerning the Divinity of Christ, and yet the very doctrine now before us is a doctrine of Christ,—if what the Scriptures teach is true, that the Church is the *body* of Christ.

Let us honor the Father by honoring the Son, and let us not dishonor the Son by treating His blessed body with disrespect! Is it asked, How far shall we carry this reverence for the incarnate Lord? Opinions will differ, and yet some degree of unanimity will remain. Who could be found of such stern texture as to reprove a poor sufferer who should have treasured up a fragment of that robe, by bare contact with the hem of which her health had been completely restored to her? Who can forget the universality of that astonishing impulse which fired the heart of Europe, and hurled its invincible chivalry upon trembling Asia? Is it impossible for us to comprehend at all the indignation with which loving hearts saw themselves excluded from the

spots once hallowed by the presence of Him who came to purchase a Church with His own blood, and those ever-memorable places desecrated by worship paid to Allah in the name of the great Arabian impostor? Even now, in this era of progress and enlightenment, in this day of utter contempt among so many for all that savors of religious sentimentality, who ever beholds from the traditional outlook upon Mount Olivet the glistening roofs and flashing domes of Judah's ancient capital without a thrill of emotion? Protestant and Catholic alike we throng Palestine's dusty roads, and delve deep beneath the roots of the Holy City, actuated by the common impulse of love to the matchless Being who once dwelt among these scenes. Shall the city over whose doom His tears were shed be more sacred in our eyes than the Church which He came to betroth unto Himself? If anywhere on earth there be such a Church, built upon Himself and framed by His own hands, though no other reason could by acutest human intellect be even conjectured, yet drawn towards that Church by love and reverence for its divine Founder, surely with more than crusader's courage, diligence and perseverance will we urge on our way through deserts, floods, mountains, and hosts of deadliest foemen, till at last our eyes gleam with a delight far beyond that which pervaded Godfrey's army when journeying onwards from Nicæa, and Dorylæum, and the long-besieged Antioch, they at last beheld the glorious view open out before them from the heights above Emmaus.

CHAPTER II.

THEORY OF THE CHURCH.

Two theories are widely held respecting the nature and seat of authority within the church, which theories, antagonistic as they may seem, let it be our task to reconcile with each other, so far at least as to show that they are not mutually destructive; nor let us be dismayed though the discussion should be found to involve an examination of the most intricate problems of political science. Of these the one searches for all authority in those who occupy the seats of the Apostles as being divinely commissioned, empowered, and guided ambassadors on earth of the King of kings, the only ones who ought to have any voice in legislation, any share in witnessing, or power in administration; while the other seeks this authority in the collective body of believers, maintaining that the Church of Christ is a society in which reigns perfect equality of rights and from which emanates all prerogative of ministerial function. And thus the tocsin sounds, warning *Monarchist* and *Republican* to range themselves in hostile fronts and unsheathe the weapons of religious warfare. Without entering into the arena of politics farther than the necessity of the case seems to compel, it is impossible to avoid altogether the dust and unpleasant odor of that much-trodden floor.

The attempt to institute a *model* government has not yet attained conspicuous success. As most flattering to human pride the theory of popular rule has now the most numerous following in many enlightened countries, and daily counts its proselytes with much exultation. Just one century since, a republic was introduced upon the stage of the New World amid the throes of a gigantic struggle in which the infant matched its thews and sinews with the practiced muscles of earth's mightiest kingdom. The babe was no barbarian's child, but the offspring of highly developed man, inheriting both noble qualities of head and heart character-

istic of the predominating Anglo-Saxon race, and a rich treasury of tradition. Under what more favorable circumstances could any republic have begun its career than did the Thirteen States, deeply imbued by nature, as descendants of the Commons of England, with an invincible love of liberty and a sincere reverence for law and order, and guided by such men as Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, Hamilton, and the Adamses, men trained under that matchless embodiment of common sense and high wisdom, the English Common-law? The Constitution drawn up by students of the lore of ages taught by the experiences of their forefathers during the Great Rebellion and the despotic rule of the Tudors, and adopted by the young commonwealth, was no Utopian scheme of a recluse philosopher, but one that ten decades of additional experience have hardly been able to improve upon. Yet thoughtful and patriotic men hesitate now before pronouncing the attempt at democratic government an assured success. The public opinion, upon the influence of which so much stress has been laid all along, has not shown itself adequate to the task of maintaining in high places that integrity, purity, and elevation of sentiment, which *were* found when the incomparable hero retired to his ancestral acres to await the summons that should crown Mt. Vernon with a halo of sanctity, and of which the continued absence must soon realize the novelist's fiction of "Glek-Nas" or "Universal Strife-Rot."

Certain objections can easily be raised against the very theory of a democracy. As long as men continue what they are, always have been, and seem likely to remain; as long as the average free man is not inaccessible to bribery (if the proffered sum is large enough) at the polls, or in the jury-box, or wheresoever; as long as the populace is devoid of wisdom sufficient to decide upon intricate points of public policy and international law, of discernment to pass upon the merits of various candidates for office, and above all of self-restraint to prefer definitely, and decisively, and in practice, lasting advantage to the mere whim, craving, or passion of the hour; as long, in fine, as the mass of mankind are *unconverted*, some people will strive in vain to satisfy themselves that the rule of that mass must of necessity result in advancing the highest interests of all. If on the one hand the sway of a single, arbitrary will be almost sure to impel the ship of state irresistibly towards the quicksands of Oriental servitude, on the other

no rule is so utterly cruel, heartless, unscrupulous, blind, furious, and destructive as that of a *mob*.

If we look for *a perfect* form of government we shall search in vain, as we shall also if we seek one that is made obligatory upon us by any principles of right reason and natural equity. We are not born with the right to rule ourselves, but under an imperative necessity and a divinely-sanctioned duty to obey our parents; and as the very circumstance of being forced by our birth upon a household which owes us nothing but maintenance, protection, and education obliges us to conform to the regulations of that household in which Divine Providence has placed us, so the mere fact of having seen the light for the first time beneath the broad folds of our proud flag may be thought to adjust upon our shoulders, as by divine mandate, the yoke of subjection to the authority duly constituted in this land, whether it be republican, aristocratic, or monarchical. The desirable and attainable government upon earth is the one in which the balance of conflicting influences and interests and powers is best preserved; in which the advantages of all species of governments are most happily combined to the most thorough exclusion of their disadvantages. The groundwork of this government may be of democratic character, but modified much more than it is even now in the United States, by the introduction and incorporation of the best elements of autocracy and aristocracy.

Whatever may be urged concerning the inherent rights of man when we are engaged upon matters of temporal rule, the most heedless might be expected to pause before transporting the same ideas into the religious realm. Shall man talk of his *natural and inalienable rights* before his God? What right has the sinner but the awful claim upon his due share of everlasting torment and Almighty wrath? None whatever. Man may impiously rebel against his eternal sovereign, but he will do so at his peril; over all alike, redeemed and unredeemed, reigns one absolute and unquestionable and omnipotent and all-wise Will. What rights man has are conceded to him in kindness and mercy, not yielded as his inherently. If the Church of God be republican in its constitution, it is so because its Supreme Founder thought best to ingraft somewhat of republicanism upon the absolutism of His righteous domination, not because it would have been inequitable for Him to establish a dominion as absolute as that of Peter of Russia or Innocent of Rome.

The dangers which threaten dominion everywhere threaten it in the religious sphere. If Guizot or Döllinger or Pusey were called upon to frame an ideally perfect constitution for a new church, they would employ their minds, it may be supposed, in guarding against certain known evil tendencies. If there is one of these which would tower high above all others, it is the drift towards extreme centralization. Place all authority in a caste, and graduate that authority in ascending scale until almost irresponsible power becomes vested in a very few holding their office for life, and visions loom before the startled imagination of the Papacy and its Curia. With caste interests, feelings, enthusiasm, the priesthood, swaying an influence which flows from the other world, controlling the destinies of eternity as well as of time, soon learns its power and exerts it with ever-growing unscrupulousness to the gradual ruining of its proper usefulness. Waxing fat upon the rich food that loads its once frugal board it forgets self-denial, self-control, meekness, charitableness, continence, sobriety. Not only does the pulpit cease to rebuke vice, or denounces it with such faintness that silence were better, but the wicked lives of the gluttonous, avaricious, and lustful shepherd infect the flock. Now and again a firm hand grasps the reins and retains them long enough to ride over many a champion of law and liberty, till in the lapse of ages, the caste culminates in a ruler who acknowledges no restraint, and fears no superior, and submits his conduct to no judgment; while far below surges an indiscriminate mass of unthinking souls which, renouncing all right to employ the individual mind in the search for truth or the determination of right, take the law from the priest's mouth so slavishly that Manhood slinks away from the pitiful sight.

On the other side, the perils are scarcely less. Taught that no authority resides in the ministry, save what the people may see fit to delegate, and thus thrown back each individual upon himself as the sole and competent judge of every question of truth or duty that may come before him, what shall prevent the man from becoming unduly inflated with a sense of his own importance, and demonstrating this presently by throwing off all that restrains the humble-minded when tempted to stray into forbidden fields or scale unsafe heights; by presumptuously questioning all revelation, and resolving mystery and miracle into ignorance and credulity; by rejecting all aid from the wise,

learned, and pious in deciding and explaining the truths of Christianity; by spurning at the superstitions of temple and public worship, in order to bestow an undeserved exaltation upon the fictitious spirituality of unspoken praise and prayer; and finally by leaping the hedges of morality in order to roam at large with the plea in his mouth that the notion of *wrong* is only the mistake of a trammeled intellect? Yes, dear reader, if the one tendency has written itself in characters of vivid brightness upon the sad pages of Roman story, the other has drawn the outlines and begun the shading of a picture that grows darker every hour since the mighty convulsion of the sixteenth century set upon its feet the principle of democracy well nigh crushed in Europe beneath the heel of Leo. Are we not justified, then, in looking for some organized society in which neither pure monarchy nor pure democracy exists, but a fit blending of the two? Or shall we approach the investigation predetermined to reject everything that wears the semblance of the slightest departure from what never was realized upon earth, nor ever will be, an absolutely pure *rule of the many?*

Still, the impartial mind must confess, under no circumstances can the Church merit the unmitigated abhorrence of the lover of liberty. To what but the Church do we owe the universal emancipation of Christendom from serfdom? During those ages when Liberty seemed to have no shrine in all the earth, those ages which awaited the downfall of Constantinople, in order that imprisoned learning might break forth and visit the West so long immersed in ignorance, what stood forth as the protector of the poor, the guardian of the oppressed, the foster-nurse of talent, courage, and enterprise? Whither could an aspiring youth turn, sure that the obscurity of his birth would prove no insurmountable obstacle to advancement? In what ranks did every one stand free and equal, except so far as talent, genius, or what was held to be the divine commission, promoted the worthy? Protestantism did not create liberty, any more truly than it did the Bible or the Faith. The true idea of liberty, that of scope to follow out one's highest interests under the restraint and protection of just and wise law, without compulsion or annoyance, this is the root idea of the Christian life: it was only natural that this conception, vague and indefinite perhaps, but still gradually crystallizing, should transfer itself to the civil life. Thus Religion,

as understood by the Christian, becomes inevitably, unless Religion herself be sadly mangled, the mother of civil liberty. Such has she been always, and such may she continue till the last refuge of the oppressor has disappeared before her advance.

It is time to see what kind of a Church our Saviour did found. Towards the close of His visible ministry, He honored His immediate followers with a charge that has very much the sound of a high, distinct, and personal commission, the record of which is contained in certain well-known passages of the Bible not to be omitted from any scheme of divinity that is to gain the ear of such as reverence inspiration. The charge to go into all the world, teach, preach, and baptize may have been given to the Twelve alone; and so to them only *may* have been addressed the promise of perpetual presence; but how shall we prove this to the degree of certainty that seems to be required by what we may call the *Monarchical* theory of Ecclesiastical Authority? Even admitting that the demonstration can reach a high *probability*, that seems an insecure foundation for the vast edifice we wish to erect upon it. No exclusive language is used in any case which forbids our imagining that the whole number of the one hundred and twenty were present, together with the eleven, when Jesus entered the apartment in which they were assembled, or disappeared from their heavenward gaze, and sent down the Holy Spirit in cloven tongues of fire; and it is perfectly apparent that the inclusion of a single presbyter or layman, who remained such, in the commission, invalidates the whole theory. The utmost that can be said is that the *eleven* are mentioned with a certain particularity. Well! Is there no conceivable reason for this care to specify that chosen band, except that to them alone were the mandatory words spoken? Besides, such an interpretation as is put upon these passages militates against the general drift of the Acts and the Epistles, which represent the whole Church, and not any particular class within it, as being the special recipient of the divine bounty and object of God's loving care and marked favor, and moreover as possessing corporate life and delegated power.

But, even granting that to the Apostles alone were originally given the commission, the promises, and the Holy Spirit, what results? They did not suffer the commission to expire with the last survivor, nor did they selfishly strive to retain the grace of

God within their twelve souls alone, and the promises manifestly stretch on far beyond the brief duration of their lives. On the Church's birthday we behold them imparting the gift of the Holy Ghost unto three thousand converts, of whom the great majority can hardly be supposed to have been ordained to the ministry. At once, then, we have a great number of souls added to the Church, and filled with the Holy Ghost. Furthermore, whithersoever the Gospel penetrates, the whole multitude of converts indiscriminately receive the same gift by the laying on of apostolic hands, and become *saints, members of the body of Christ, temples of the Holy Ghost.* May we not justly inquire to what intent and purpose the Divine Spirit condescended to take up His residence in ordinary Christians, the rank and file (so to speak) of the great army? Did He do this merely to satisfy the private wants of the individual? Emphatically, no! He imparted to them His life-giving power in order that they might play their parts manfully in the great contest, in order that, being organically united with the Head in heaven, they might be permeated and invigorated by the divine life, and fulfill each his own function in the living body. Whatsoever prerogatives and powers the Apostles possessed they transmitted to others, nor solely to those who were to govern the Church as their own successors and substitutes, but to presbyters, deacons, and laymen, enduing each with an appropriate measure of divine grace to enable them to stand in their appointed lots. Thus as the Church expanded, each and every soul added to it by complete apostolic baptism became a vital part of its organism, participating in the duties, privileges, blessings, and gifts of the original Twelve; and this, although by hypothesis these were in the first place bestowed upon them exclusively.

Now, is this hypothesis capable of definite establishment? It was shown above that its correctness cannot certainly be deduced from the texts which are understood to convey the commission; but that was by no means equivalent to an admission that it cannot be proved at all. We need not, however, attempt to demonstrate any more than this: if others were present and addressed by our Lord on those memorable occasions, then either from failure to understand Him, remissness, or faithlessness, no one of them ever undertook to exercise coördinate power with the Twelve unless by them advanced to the episcopate. If any such

instance existed it is exceedingly strange that the world has not heard of it. On the contrary all evidence, direct and indirect, combines to evince that all power, authority, and grace were understood, in the primitive ages, to emanate from the Apostles as a *necessary intermediate source*, a something not unlike in some respects a grand distributing reservoir. We need not surely be greatly concerned about what might have happened, if some of our modern theorists had been on hand to whisper in the ears of some score of disciples, who along with the chosen band witnessed our Lord's Ascension, that they had been empowered to act in the capacity of leaders and founders as well as Peter, John, or Matthew; for none such were there to perplex the Church; and if the idea ever entered their own minds it never resulted in any course of action antagonistic to the Twelve, but died still-born. Nor is this open to the objection that it is reasoning from what was to what ought to have been, for there has been nothing said about what ought to have been, a matter which does not directly concern us at all. In syllogistic form our argument frames itself with a postulate for a minor premiss: All authority to act for God and convey His mercies to mankind must come from Him; and for the major: Since the death of the last man who heard the human voice of Christ no authority has existed as derived from God through any other than the apostolic channel; from all which we are permitted to draw the conclusion absolutely affirming that: Since that date no authority to act for God with mankind in His Church *has* existed except such as can distinctly trace out its derivation from that intermediate fountain. If Washington had been defeated at Trenton, and either taken captive or driven into the Delaware, the English would have subjugated the colonies, and later granted letters patent, under the royal seal, for the rich bottom lands of the West; but Washington was not defeated, and the Declaration of Independence did not become the death-warrant of its signers, and a grant from King George or Queen Victoria would not now entitle the holder to standing room east or west of the Mississippi. What *might have been* cannot affect what *is*.

That this is to a certain extent reasoning backwards need not be denied: it *does* amount in a great measure to explaining the Lord's meaning by His hearers' understanding of it, and ascertaining that by their action under it. If my readers are disposed to

regard this as unsatisfactory, I join them in saying that it would be more satisfactory to build directly upon an *unquestionable* interpretation of His blessed words; only, unfortunately, that seems impossible: wherefore wisdom requires the adoption of the next best method, or the best that we can command, which course we humbly conceive has now been adopted.

We must not, however, peremptorily close the investigation just where we choose. While this method has thus far largely favored the *Monarchical* theory by establishing the divine authority as residing in the ministry, it may presently be seen to carry us away in a very different direction. If I mistake not, tolerably plain indications of this probability have already insisted upon manifesting themselves. If, on the one hand, the Apostles seem assured that they have the exclusive power to ordain and to administer sacraments and to confirm, and that they also possess the right and ability to convey more or less of their priestly authority to men who shall rule, administer, and officiate in the subordinate orders of the Presbyterate and the Diaconate, they seem no less clear upon another point, that the Church is not composed of a ministry only. What idea displays itself from the pen of St. Luke when he informs us that "the Lord *added to the Church* daily such as should be saved"? How were they added? As something exterior and extraneous, clinging to the skirts of the Church? Surely not; for is it not also said that the converts "continued stedfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers"? Made by baptism and confirmation participants in the wondrous gift of the divine Spirit, the laity were admitted into full communion and fellowship, and invited to unite in public worship and to partake of the Lord's Supper. Some portions of the Epistles to the Corinthians would be hardly intelligible did we deny to the laity all share in the administration of discipline. Can we forget the language of the fifteenth chapter of Acts: "Then pleased it the Apostles and elders *with the whole Church*, to send chosen men." Is that consistent with the exclusion of the laity from all voice in the determination of matters of the faith? Listen above all to St. Jude writing unto all those who are "sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called," with the exhortation, "That *ye* should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered"—not to Apostles, not to the ministry, but to the entire

Church—"*to the saints.*" Indeed, are not all said to be "priests" unto God? The laity may not without great sin and danger presume to exercise the especial functions of the priesthood, but must be in some true and important sense qualified to approach near unto their God both in word and act, in order to justify the application to them of that title. Is it not almost sure that Confirmation administered according to its original intention is a minor species of ordination? Conveying the Holy Ghost to all who had not been baptized by the hands of those who had ordaining power, did it not bestow upon them enlightenment, guidance, and strength from above, and if so, were not *their* enlightenment, guidance, and strength necessary parts of the full measure vouchsafed to the entire body? That the apostolate had more of this grace, is no reason why we should pass over in oblivion what little the commonalty received, for the inferior species or lesser measure may be just as necessary in its way and degree as the superior and more abundant.

Have we not now pronounced clearly in favor of the *Democratic* theory of Church government. If convinced that the Spirit is diffused in power and authority throughout the entire body, it is natural enough at first glance to lose sight of the importance of ministerial authority, under the supposition that an organization instinct with the Spirit must be fully competent to appoint its own officers. Here, however, it will be prudent to tread with extreme caution. Why, we ask, *must* such a body possess that power? There is no reason why God should not retain the appointing power in His own hand, and exert it Himself personally or through the medium of agents; but there *is* sufficient justification for His refusal to man of such unlimited liberty as this would imply, to be found in the need there always is for many restraints to be put upon the willfulness of our race. The pith of the whole matter is perhaps of some such consistency as this: the minister is not intended to be the servant of his flock, but the ambassador of God, who may often have occasion to use the strongest, sternest, severest language of Elijah or Jeremiah. His position should be a somewhat independent one, for how else shall he summon courage to speak like the austere Baptist, or after the pattern of that meek Sufferer who yet denounced woe upon the enemies of truth repeatedly and in such awful terms? The preacher of extraordinary fearlessness may, moved only by

his own unquenchable horror of wrong and love of the right, boldly cry aloud and spare not; but we cannot expect to depend for our regular supply of clergymen upon the hope of finding extraordinary men; and even had we thousands of such champions, how could they bear up against the contemptuous wrath of a people always ready to shout, You are our creatures! Do as we bid you? How immeasurably better will it be for the people to understand plainly that, though they themselves may elect their presbyter or bishop, the man of their choice would thrust his feet into the shoes of Korah should he presume to stand at the altar or the font before God's commission had been conveyed to him by apostolic ordination! If some catastrophe, such as that cruel feast of the dying Idumean, should destroy the entire episcopate to a man, the Church would have heard its death-knell in the voice that carried the news: not all the priests, deacons, and laymen in the world could make a single humble deacon, much less a successor to the high seat of an Apostle. To teach the great lessons of humility, dependence, and reverence, and to clothe the prophetic office with the independence necessary for it to act faithfully the watchman's part in Zion, God's wisdom reserved to itself the power of putting into ministerial position.

Then, on the other side, the bishop can effect little or nothing without the Church, less, if possible, than the Church without its bishop. In a state of excision, he can confirm and ordain, but he is as powerless as an unborn babe to bestow the gift of the Holy Ghost. In all the old disputes about converts from heretical and schismatical sects, the Church never wavered about this matter; there was, it is true, some question as to whether the *form* of schismatical ceremonies and rites was to be repeated, but no one seems to have imagined for a moment that an excommunicated bishop could carry the spirit of peace, order, and law away with him in his departure from the One Fold. Those baptized, confirmed, and ordained outside of that fold must in some way be given the "Peace of the Church," or they remained alien to its life forever, and had no share in the divine promises. There is held to be such a thing as a corporate life of the Church, something which, in close analogy with the physical life, penetrates to the remotest extremity of the finest nerve and vein, and resides not exclusively in brain, spinal column, lungs, or heart. If the head be Christ, it may, perhaps, not improperly be said that the

Episcopate is a great nerve which conveys to every part of the body the mandates of the Lord: sever that nerve, and the body becomes atrophied and dies; still the life is not all in one nerve, nor in all the nerves together. Besides the connection through the nerves, the head is united with the body by arterial and venous circulation: similarly from Christ flows through one channel authority, through another life.

CHAPTER III.

EPISCOPACY.

Having hitherto assumed that the government of the Apostolic Church was of the kind we call *Episcopal*, we must briefly examine the correctness of this assumption. The proof that the Apostles did transmit their plenary authority to an order of men who presently came to be styled Bishops, who alone had permission and commission to perpetuate the ministry, and beneath whom were the two subordinate orders of Presbyters and Deacons, is both Biblical and historical, and so clear, strong, full, and well known that a rapid sketch of it will answer every purpose of this discussion. That the Episcopal theory satisfies all requirements of the sacred text, affording easy and satisfactory explanation of the most obscure and indirect allusion, as well as of the direct and formal narrative, has been shown so repeatedly that it may not be amiss to regard it as a *res judicata*, at least until the numerous and powerful treatises taking this side of the question have been adequately answered, and especially until some flaw has been discovered in the elaborate argumentation of Bishop Cotterill, in his "Genesis of the Church," a work constructed according to the methods of modern science, and evolving by the inductive process so much lauded now, from a collation of the various passages in the inspired writings, that very ecclesiastical system at which is hurled the bitterest invective of philosophic thought. As for uninspired history, its testimony is, if possible, yet more unequivocal; its whole weight is thrown into the same scale. The scholar who can rise from a perusal of the ante-Nicene writers with any doubt that Ignatius, Polycarp, Irenæus, Clement, Cyprian knew of no other ecclesiastical system, must be impregnable to any reasoning we can bring to bear upon him. Nevertheless, the fact is the contrary position has been maintained by large numbers of learned, able, and pious men, not inferior to any in extent and accuracy of historical knowledge, nor

in general impartialness of judgment, and this state of the case calls for a fuller treatment of the subject than it really deserves.

The view of ministerial authority entertained by the Vatican is virtually anti-episcopal, but shall receive a very brief notice and a peremptory dismissal. As has been pointed out by the learned Barrow and many others, the papal theory is built on a series of untenable assumptions: these rival each other in fictitiousness, and yet *all* must be substantiated, or else the whole fabric falls. If a certain supremacy was bestowed by the Master on St. Peter, it is still necessary to adduce some proof that this precedency or supremacy was to survive his own life; if this be clearly established, the next step must be to affix this prerogative to the one who should succeed to that particular chair which he occupied, a matter of extreme difficulty in the eyes of those who remember that the Twelve had no metes and bounds of territorial jurisdiction, and that each probably ordained numerous bishops; and then, this impossible advance having been made, it would still remain to demonstrate that St. Peter ever was at Rome, and if he was, that he, and not St. Paul or some other bishop, ordained Linus or whoever first presided over the imperial city. It is not a breach of Christian charity to affirm distinctly that the extraordinary claims of Rome are supported wholly upon falsehood and forgery. What answer can be given to the convincing demonstration, or rather to the terrible revelations, of "Janus"? Upon "Decretals" wrongly fathered upon Isidore of Seville, two centuries subsequent to the archbishop's death, in the reign of Nicholas I., who employed them to overwhelm Hincmar of Rheims; upon the careless and unscrupulous work of a monk of the twelfth century, known as the "Decretum Gratiani;" and upon the celebrated "Donation of Constantine," forged in the reign of Charlemagne; upon these and such like clumsy and unprincipled efforts to ante-date documents that could only be made valuable through that artifice, rests the mighty throne of him who, with unblushing cheek, calls himself successor to the humble fisherman of Galilee. It must be tolerably safe to disregard pretensions that have so little self-confidence as to prop themselves up with such supports as these. If the primitive Church had been *papal* there would surely be extant some better proof of the fact than has yet been forthcoming.

An opposing theory has adopted a mode of proof not charge-

able with double dealing, equivocation, and downright, systematic fabrication of testimony like the former, but hardly better able than it to square itself with the just and acknowledged rules of historical study. When we ask for *some* tokens that the Church of the first century was Presbyterian or Congregational, what more substantial food is put into our mouths, famishing for a general pacification of Christendom, than conjectures wholly unsupported by reliable testimony? Where is the smallest fragment from apologist, historian, commentator, preacher, theological writer, or panegyrist that does not countenance Episcopacy fully as much as either an equality of bishops and presbyters, or an unmitigated Congregationalism? Instead of laying before us the documentary evidence required as an offset to the almost numberless passages adducible by the other side, the supporters of anti-episcopal theories favor us unanimously with a confession that we would not have ventured to seek at their hands.

In the middle of the second century the Church *everywhere* was governed by bishops. Lo! here is a concession of the whole dispute! If the entire Church at such an early date was episcopally governed, and no proof can be brought forward of any different state of affairs having at any time obtained, why! the discussion is at end, and drawing in our oars, we may drift placidly with the current. Nay, not so. To be sure there is no proof, nor even anything that can be tortured into proof, scarcely so much as a sentence or a clause that can be taken away from its context and twisted and molded so as to look that way,—that any change had occurred up to that date; but ingenuity can be set at work to devise some process by which episcopacy gradually supplanted the purer and more perfect form of really primitive government, and to invent some reason that this should have taken place. And so we are treated to elaborate schemes of Episcopal usurpation fabricated by active and fertile brains, and that have a general aspect characteristic of the compulsory products of hard-pushed minds bestridden by favorite theories. Our purpose is by far too serious and too kindly to admit of indulgence in ridicule; therefore let us not laugh at the straits of these theorists, but do our best to convince them of their mistakes.

Let us first measure the dimensions of our conceded fact. *Everywhere* the Church in the second century was *Episcopal.* One exception, however, has been unearthed by diligence of

exploration hardly excelled by Layard or Livingston. In the Church of Alexandria, Jerome is supposed to tell us, the custom had existed from the very days of St. Mark, that when the See had become vacant the presbyters should meet together, elect a new bishop from their own number, and advance him without further ceremony to the empty seat. Yet Jerome, almost in the same breath, says that there is this difference between a bishop and a presbyter, that the former has the power of ordaining. Now, Jerome does not say that after the bishop had been chosen he did not repair to the successors of the Apostles to receive consecration, nor do the words properly *imply* that he did not so do, as any one can see who will be at the pains to consult the *ipsissima verba* of that learned writer. Whatever, though, may have been the case at Alexandria, the Alexandria of Cyril and Athanasius, the economy of the residue of the churches is not in any doubt at all. In the Holy Land, where the Church was cradled, bishops had ruled in regular succession from St. James. At Antioch was a settled episcopate. The seven Apocalyptic Churches bear witness to the unvarying custom in Asia Minor. Parthia, India, the whole East had bishops, if it had Christianity at all. Greece, Italy, Spain, Gaul, Britain acknowledged the lawful sway of Apostolic officers. Nor must Northern Africa be forgotten in such a survey. How had such a total and unrecorded change been effected? Is it not strange that no single national Church, with the more than doubtful exception of the Alexandrian, had retained the original system? That overmastering influence swept from the farthest Orient, from beyond the utmost reach of Alexander's conquering advance, across Persia, Babylonia, and Mesopotamia, across Syria, Arabia, and Egypt, unchecked by Bosphorus or Hellespont, by Euphrates or Po, enveloping Rome, Milan, and Arles in its resistless progress, nor stopping till the blue waters of the wide Atlantic rolled before it unploughed by keel of believing mariner; nor left in all that boundless territory one smallest society of Christians unvisited, nor so much as a vestige or a memory to indicate the work it had accomplished. Never flood nor sand-storm, avalanche nor lava-torrent did its work of effacement so completely. No blackened tree-stump, nor unsubmerged peak, nor splintered mast-head, nor protruding pillar or obelisk, nor even a gray mound, remained to tell the story of what had been. Not a fragment of the broken

ship, not a rag of clothing, has been cast up on the shores. Like the Cities of the Plain these old institutions have vanished, and no eye can penetrate the dense waters to the buried walls over which surge the billows of centuries; not even a Lot has escaped to remind us of the past, nor has one single spectator committed to tradition even that he beheld the signs of the destruction from afar. Are revolutions accustomed to be so complete, instantaneous, and unresisted? Imagine all Europe converted upon the instant into a vast sisterhood of republics, or the United States into an absolute monarchy, and all done so thoroughly that every one forgot what had been before, never even mentioning the past in any hour of discontent, nor telling to the young by the blazing hearth the tale of the revolution! History has not omitted to preserve the story of contests for power that broke out among the followers of Mohammed almost before he was cold, and continued until different caliphates had established themselves by the strong hand. What revolution ever took place unheeded and unrecorded? Ideas may circulate among the masses for long years unnoticed save by a few close and far-seeing students of political affairs, but by and by the suppressed forces break forth, the city is barricaded, the palace sacked, the Bastile demolished, and a Reign of Terror inaugurated that will be remembered till it is at last eclipsed by the awfulness, and horror to the wicked, of the Judgment Day. History passes unnoticed the tranquil happiness of a prosperous nation, forgetting a whole century of its advance, but dwells at length upon the symptoms, incidents, and results of the convulsion which arouses it by the summons to arms. Were there, forsooth, in the Church of God, endowed as it was with the glorious freedom of serving the Lord, deeply imbued with the steadfast courage that dreads no pain nor agony, and not deficient in independence and vigor of thought, no sturdy presbyters manfully to resist the encroachments of a haughty prelacy, no Jeromes to thunder forth in distinct and forcible language rebuke to the usurping and grasping spirit of their superiors? Was there no little Netherlands to brave the wrath of their tyrannical sovereign, the prince of all usurpers? Rather let us be sure that Christendom would fairly have rung with the shouts of the combatants, and the latest ages would have stopped their ears at the din. Why! Within the first three decades of its life the Church began to be torn by the dissensions of such as those who at

Corinth disputed St. Paul's authority. Judge from his language concerning these men, whether, if disputes arose about ministerial authority, they were likely to disturb the peace of the brethren.

Then, too, it may not be uninstructive to consider the likelihood of the bishops' attempting to carry out such ambitious projects—or *presbyters*, we should say, inasmuch as by hypothesis they are not yet arrived at the dignity after which they are reaching. When a man sought the bishopric what honors, privileges, aimed he to gain? Let Polycarp answer from the flames of Smyrna, or Ignatius from the teeth of the wild beasts to which he had surrendered himself in defense of his sheep. Are such the men from whom we expect self-interested, avaricious, or ambitious conduct? Did Ignatius raise himself by chicanery, nepotism, bribery, and terrorism above his fellow-presbyters in order that he might bear the brunt of hatred, persecution, and torture? The confusion of dates is a source of much error. The Roman world was not yet converted and enlisted in support of the Cross: it was pagan, heartily, thoroughly, madly pagan, and made holidays of casting Christians to lions and tigers, besides lighting the way to the revels by placing them, pitch-besmeared, at street-corners, in lieu of torches. A bishop, to the close of this period, did not bask in the genial beams of court favor, but was the grand arch-rebel, in the imperial mind, of a band of low-born, obnoxious, dangerous conspirators, who was marked for especial hatred and direst punishment. Yet we are to understand that such was the eager desire for high position, though attended with great danger of speedy martyrdom, that on all sides men, forgetful of the dignity of their calling, of the humility required from the disciples of the Crucified, of the terrible consequence of being found at the last beating the men-servants and maid-servants, of the rebuke administered to those who would be *great in the kingdom of heaven*, were striving and struggling to make the poor, suffering, persecuted infant Church a ladder by which to climb into bad preëminence after the example of Lucifer, a stone on which to sit and inflate themselves until their swelling bulk caught the eye of some hungry traveler! "Credat Judaeus Apella!"

Few who have habituated themselves to impartial reflection will be blind to the pernicious consequences of thus substituting for unbiased investigation of reliable authorities the indulgence of

a sportive fancy in unfounded conjecture and most unphilosophic theorizing. If such methods are permitted in the making up of our history, deplorable will be the results. Let it once be understood that a total, radical, universal revolution occurred in the ante-Nicene period and left behind no trace of the mighty convulsion, what then will remain to be confidently held and believed? Men will demand to know why other changes may not have taken place equally radical and equally forgotten and ignored. If the whole constitution of the Church was silently and imperceptibly altered in a century or two without so much as a single fossil remaining to testify concerning the lost forms of life, what assurance have we that vital changes were not made in other matters; for example, in the most fundamental matters of the faith? An honest and well-instructed infidel, upon carefully weighing the evidences, would, it can hardly be doubted, say that few questions of the highest moment in the whole range of theology are capable of a more definite determination than this one concerning government. Take the catholic doctrine of Christ's divinity. Writers can be found as far back as any exist to give color to the Arian hypothesis; nor does it appear that the arguments in favor of Unitarianism based upon extracts from Tertullian, Hermas, Justin Martyr, and others, have been demolished by the stupendous powers and resources of men like Bishop Bull and Dr. Waterland, one whit more thoroughly than have been by others similar arguments against episcopacy. Mark, now, the vast accession of probability that accrues to Arianism from the fact that more than one thousand years before Presbyterianism made its first open struggle, Arianism was on the verge of a complete triumph. How came it to pass, men will inquire, that anti-episcopacy died so quietly, while Arianism fought for centuries with the strength, hardihood, and relentless ferocity of a tiger? Then turning upon us, will they not continue: "You say that the primitive Church was Trinitarian. Permit us to tell you that you never made a greater mistake in your lives. The early disciples inherited from Jewish ancestors an indignant monotheism; and it was not till the purity of the early creed had been sullied by the breath and contact of paganism that this tenet began to be obscured. By your leave, Trinitarianism is the usurper. We must regretfully acknowledge that we cannot inform you precisely in what year the usurpation became estab-

lished, nor can we even exhibit to you a single leaf from the tree of original Arianism; but we can only declare that we are very sorry that the upheavals, deluges, and burnings were so terrible as to obliterate all traces of the past. We are sure that Arianism is right, therefore it must have been the original belief; consequently, inasmuch as it had to be new-created, it must have perished; and, since no records survive, they must have been lost." The ghost of Episcopius thereupon, perceiving upon our faces a smile not to be concealed by the most earnest effort of courtesy, cries almost fiercely: "If our conjecture is baseless and wild, pray tell us how the world happened to awake one morning and find itself Arian! If this doctrine had not all the while been surging beneath the surface, how came it to burst forth with such impetuosity and in such volume?" If the supporters of the anti-episcopal hypothesis would only pause long enough to remember that the various books of the New Testament were not definitely and finally collected into one volume till the fourth century, the Canon of Holy Scripture having previously been of a somewhat fluctuating and uncertain nature, and that many of the most important doctrines of the Christian faith were not formulated till even later, they surely would feel extreme reluctance to introduce into the entire proof of our religion such an element of uncertainty as they seem disposed to cherish in the bosom of fond paternity.

The fox in ancient fable looking up at unattainable grapes pronounced them sour. To constitute Renard the prototype of the Continental reformers would be neither graceful nor accurate. Yet we must be allowed to feel suspicious of a theory that wears every appearance of being an after-thought invented to meet the urgent requirements of a hard case. However, the actual responsibility of its invention must be added to the long list of crimes for which Roman ambition and avarice will be accountable before the bar of God. Starting from the level of the episcopal brotherhood, the so-called successor of St. Peter soon left far behind and out of sight the day of his severe rebuke by St. Cyprian, and after a time had raised his towering head so far aloft that from the elevation of his pride an ordinary bishop's throne seemed no higher than the presbyter's seat. The evidence of the existence from the very first of a *three-fold* ministry being so strong that even papal arrogance might not disregard it, the only way open

out of this difficulty for the upward soaring of the pretender to the vicegerency of God was that of consolidating two of the existing orders, so that there might seem to be three only, when in reality four existed. Seizing upon the fact that language had often been employed which embraced the two orders in question within one common *priesthood*, and choosing to ignore the parallel fact that all these, being *servants* and *ministers* of God, might with entire propriety be termed *deacons* or *diaconi*, the Lord High-Priest of Rome, in public document and private letter, indulged his vanity and sought to advance his interests by flaunting this fact in the faces of his fellow-bishops, telling them with insulting plainness that the whole *priesthood* held its office by the grace, and at the pleasure, of the sovereign pontiff. This false theory presently gained control of the minds of Western churchmen, till by the fifteenth century it was almost universally held among them. Upon disenthralling themselves from the iron yoke of the Pope, the Reformers retained with little question a theory which suited them so well as did that of the equality of rank between Bishop and Presbyter, a theory which saved them the trouble and delay which might have attended the attempt to supply themselves with a valid episcopate. Presbyters they had in abundance, for Luther and the other leaders of the movement had been almost all of them regularly ordained to that office in the Romish Church, but Rome had taken such good care to fill the higher positions with her own creatures, men who were not likely to display much independence of thought, vehemence of zeal, or courageousness of endurance, that bishops could not be counted upon to throng the highways of an uprising against tyranny and false doctrine. Nevertheless, with such a name among them as that of the Prince Archbishop of Cologne, Hermann of glorious memory, the reformers could not plead inability to obtain the Succession. Bishops, however, did not swell their ranks in any numbers, and so it was but natural that they should gladly close with the teaching that proclaimed them unnecessary, and, after they had thoroughly committed themselves to this doctrine, earnestly attempt to show that antiquity sanctioned it. But, as concerns us, when we are able to trace out thus clearly the history of its rise and progress, and also have discovered such weighty inducements to its acceptance, we are not justly to be blamed if in our eyes it is enveloped with extreme suspiciousness, seeming to bear the stamp of a make-shift brought

in to serve a purpose and then supported afterwards with such arguments as most readily presented themselves to minds deeply interested to make the most of them.

We take leave of this subject with the remark that a doctrine which is wholly unsupported by positive evidence; which seems to be little more than an arbitrary conjecture; which involves the supposition of a revolution, as radical as any that have convulsed continents, clearing away, and not leaving behind so much as a fleck of mist upon the face of history; which constitutes men at once rapacious demagogues and holy martyrs; which unsettles the whole foundation of the Christian faith; and which suited so admirably the necessities of both those who, if they did not introduce it, certainly revived it after a long period of hibernation, and of those who inherited and improved it, is not one that the most imposing array of respectable authorities can redeem from suspicion; and furthermore that no alternative seems to remain but that of admitting the truthfulness of a theory so capable of explaining all the facts that no escape from its conclusiveness could be found, but one that does such violence to history, religion, and common sense.

CHAPTER IV.

CONTINUITY AND RISE OF THE CHURCH.

Much uncertainty in the theological, as well as in the popular, mind envelops the question, When did the Christian Church begin to exist? This obscurity arises in a great degree from steadily repressing the fact that the Christian Church was a continuation of the Jewish. Whether it was not the original design of God to make the blending more perfect than it really became, to transmute visibly the synagogue and temple into church and cathedral,—a design which was frustrated through the rejection of Him who came primarily to be *their* Messiah by the bulk of the Jewish nation,—may safely be left to the decision of any one who will carefully and without prejudice peruse St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, and the Epistle to the Hebrews; but it is manifest that, even as the event happened, after the stubbornness and rebelliousness of that perverse race had borne its proper fruit, the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa were scrupulously respected, reverenced, taught, obeyed, although the Gospel soon had its own sacred books; the old belief was not in any sense supplanted, except so far as sophistry had distorted it, but rather ratified, enlarged, and elevated by the new Revelation; the sacred rites merely ceased by intrinsic limitation, circumcision, and the offering of sacrifices, really finding their prolongation and perfection in Baptism and the Holy Eucharist; the Aaronic ministry yielded up its functions to the revived Melchisedechian priesthood, perpetuating, nevertheless, its threefoldness in the three orders of the Evangelical; the observance of special seasons was carried onward with hardly a break, those of divine obligation, the Passover, the Feast of Weeks, and the Feast of Tabernacles, passing over into Good Friday and its closely-connected festival of Easter, the Christian Pentecost, and Christmas, respectively; and finally the entire Remnant, so far as it did not forfeit

all claim to be God's peculiar people, was merged bodily into the new organization, only losing its own identity to the extent implied in a mighty advance, and an incorporation into itself of the surrounding nations, according to those wonderful and glorious prophecies which cheered the darkest day of Israel with promises that the Light would shine from Zion, and all nations come flowing unto it. Born of Jewish parentage, born under the Law, born heir to the throne of David, and to the whole circle of Messianic prophecies, Jesus, son of Mary, and putative son of Joseph, bowed His own neck to bear the yoke of rite, ceremony, and observance, beginning His obedience on the eighth day of His infant existence, and not intermitting attendance, at hazard of His life, upon the services of the temple at Dedication or Passover, till that solemn evening on which He partook of the last Paschal meal, and then went to the garden of the Betrayal. His own ministrations were, at least mainly, confined to descendants of Jacob, and not extended beyond the territorial limits of the Promised Land; and so were those of His commissioned disciples, not only during His life on earth, but for years thereafter. To a man, the Twelve were Jews, and so probably were the Seventy. Thus, it being true that, while as the Eternal Son of God Jesus Christ might well have founded a Church entirely *de novo*, He nevertheless chose to follow the analogy of His own regulations for the ancient Church, and thereby present to mankind a most striking instance and evidence of the continuity of His dealings with them; we cannot be surprised that the exact point of time at which the waning brightness of the evening succumbed to the twilight of the dawn cannot be definitely determined to the satisfaction of everybody.

The road out of the difficulty follows for much of its length the curves of a causeway lately erected by us. We have seen that a wide difference exists between authority and life. The Blessed Master left the one behind Him when He disappeared from the Mount of Ascension; but the other He conveyed not until, having gone up on high and received gifts for men, He sent in His stead that Divine Spirit which rested in cloven tongues upon the assembled disciples. It is true that an objection might be grounded upon that most solemn act of our Lord, in breathing upon the disciples, with the significant words, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost;" but must that not have been a *prospective* dona-

tion, one anticipatory of the approaching day of His actual bestowment, conveying not the actual gift, but only the power to receive it? The only recorded act, we can safely affirm, of the Apostles during the period of their waiting, which can be construed into evidence, that they supposed themselves to have already had imparted to them the "Promise of the Father," in reality rather negatives such a supposition,—the election, *by lot*, of a successor to the apostate Judas.

The Day of Pentecost, immediately succeeding the Passover on which her Lord was crucified, was the *birthday* of the Church. What life the Church had previously was *ante-natal*. On that memorable day came to the birth, and was safely ushered into independent existence (if its present existence can in any sense be called *independent*), that little infant which was soon to grasp so vigorously, while yet in its cradle, the swelling throat of the forked-tongued adversary, and go forth to cleanse the Augean stables of pagan abomination, and deliver the earth, one after another, from the vices that made havoc over its surface. Vivifying originally the congregated band in the upper chamber at Jerusalem, this heaven-descended life soon extended itself to the three thousand, and from that time onward invigorated the multitudes who were daily added to the Church. Authority had rested upon the Twelve before. One had gone "to his own place," and thereupon the authority had been transferred and imparted to the one who stood up in his stead; but thus far the authority had been little more than a blank form; now, however, substance is infused thereinto, and the little band becomes a living body, duly incorporated, and shielded by the arm of Jehovah. Before the Day of Pentecost, the sacraments, rites, and duties specifically Christian existed not, save in an inchoate form; from that date Christian Baptism began to be administered, confirming hands to be laid upon those baptized, and the Holy Communion to be consecrated. John's baptism of repentance was now replaced by that *of water and the Spirit*. The disciples of Christ bestowed no longer the comparatively barren form upon penitents, but washed away their sins in the blood of the Lamb, regenerated them in the fountain of eternal life, and gave them the precious gift of the indwelling Paraclete; all which operations were impossible until Christ had paid the infinite price, conquered death, carried His triumphant and glorified humanity into His Father's presence,

and by Him been rewarded with the power of sending down the Spirit of life, and truth, and comfort.

Thereafter, almost imperceptibly, and contesting every foot of ground, Jewish ceremonies vanished from the midst of the Church. That converts from Judaism should have been slow to surrender the traditions of centuries is not greatly to their discredit; some, perhaps, will regard that steadfast adherence to the past as a bright testimonial to the solidity, loyalty, and reverentialness of the Jewish character. Even the vehement Paul lends countenance to this last view, when he circumcises Timothy, and shaves his own head at Cenchræa, because he has a vow. This most zealous and utterly fearless man will not suffer any such burden to be laid upon the unaccustomed back of the Gentile converts, but will not forbid the Jewish to struggle along under the unnecessary load of a burdensome ceremonial, if their consciences prompt them to make the attempt, so long as God has not given visible token that the old has passed away. The rent veil, exposing to unhallowed gaze what none but the anointed eye of God's High Priest might behold, was a hardly mistakable sign that the Almighty was displeased with His people, or was passing from them; but, still, was not the predicted flash of lightning shining from east to west, and clearly revealing the close of the Mosaic dispensation. That flash lit the sky when Titus's soldiery hurled the prohibited brand against the sacred edifice and wrapped it in the blaze of annihilation; when chain, and lash, and cross tore the famished survivors from the ruins of their country's pride; when the stern edict of an exasperated tyrant scattered priest, and Levite, and people over the whole globe, divorcing them by the might of irresistible force from the duty of an impossible obedience to an extinct law administrable only by a priesthood that had perished.

Once born, the Church grew with amazing rapidity. It has often happened to new religions to spread far and wide in a surprisingly short space of time: that founded by Gautama Buddha did this, and so did that one which was dandled upon the knees of the licentious prophet of Mecca. To account for such phenomena *natural causes* can alone be called in by those who disbelieve in the doctrines advocated; nor need we hesitate to say that the case of Mohammedanism, for example, is adequately explained by these. A religion which promises unlimited sensual

indulgence hereafter at the easy cost of not very onerous outward observances, and carries a naked sword in its hand, can claim with very poor grace that its triumphs could only have been achieved by the favor of Heaven. Surely, the *forbearance* of Heaven and the aiding hand of *hell* are more likely to have brought about the result! Causes for the rapid progress of Christianity more creditable to humanity than these, but yet just as far from being superhuman, have been discovered, and set forth with remarkable power, by the great historian of the Decadence, the wide circulation of whose incomparable work necessitates the turning of our attention to the question involved.

Christianity certainly *was* favored by circumstances of no inconsiderable moment, such as the opening up by commerce and the military arm of numberless channels of communication, the wide diffusion of the Latin and Greek tongues, the culmination of Roman civilization, the central position of Palestine, universal peace, and the mysterious prevalence of a general sighing after a deliverer; and likewise by the nature of the religion itself, which in its profound, hopeful, pure, and lofty doctrine, in its admirable organization, and in the unselfish, noble spirit it inculcated and created, met the higher requirements of humanity, and forged the weapons of success. But some of these causes which are supposed to account for its swift advance proceed upon a forgetfulness that what will give currency to a religion already established *may* rather impede than assist its early rise. Shall one ignore the patent fact, for instance, that the same road upon which missionaries journeyed afforded equal facilities for couriers to travel with the persecuting edicts of the emperors? Then, too, the whole argument rests upon the extraordinary fallacy that the human heart generally chooses the good when it recognizes it, and follows it out when chosen! Who is there that can credit the statement, that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul disposed the philosophic mind favorably towards the new creed, if he recollects the experience of St. Paul on Mars Hill? Or who can agree with Gibbon when he speaks of the high tone of morality in the early Church as rendering the faith attractive, that has not blinded himself to that strange weakness and perversity of our race which makes us cling to the evil even while we see and approve and love the opposite? The honest philosopher will rather admit that the foes which confronted the Church of the Apostles were simply gigantic.

No more bitter adversaries assailed the first missionaries than their own brethren according to the flesh. So thoroughly had the teachings of the rabbis warped and distorted Judaism that it seemed to have faced about entirely, and to have forgotten the very purpose for which it was called into the field, or rather to have marshaled itself in deadly hostility to that design. True, God's will was not thwarted, for Judaism had really been the means of preparing for the reception of the Gospel the hearts of the faithful few; but for the vast majority, that which should have been to them for their best advantage and highest gain became unto them an occasion of falling into endless ruin. The strongest sentiments of the average Jew had become a boundless pride in his own ancestry, coupled with an intense contempt for all who were not children of Abraham, and an eager longing for the resuscitation and expected augmentation of the faded glories of David's kingdom; and we are to be told that the Jewish nation, after cherishing such sentiments for a thousand years, after hugging such fond delusions during a long exile and continuous period of oppression and the heroic struggles of the Maccabean era, was likely to close eagerly with the offers of a prophet who had come to throw open the gates of the inner court to those who were despised as *Gentiles* or *Barbarians* and to destroy forever the hope of a conquering monarch! The new doctrines were utterly abhorrent to the carnal mind of Pharisee, and Sadducee, and Herodian alike, so that one and all they forgot their various disputes in order to unite in deadly league against the hated Nazarenes. As they treated, in their wanton cruelty, the Master, so dealt they with the disciples. Having crucified Him, they stoned, beat, dragged on the pavement, crucified these. Greedily snatching at the faintest gleam of hope offered by an obscure Gaulonite, they slew the true Jesus and hunted down His servants with the mad zeal of the unconverted Saul, improving against them every opportunity of false accusation or seditious gathering when unable to use open violence, and dogging their steps from city to city. At other times, changing their tactics, they even feigned themselves to be Christians in order to sow disturbance in their counsels. This was the way in which Judaism took her younger sister by the hand and assisted her tottering steps.

But if thus thoroughly did the disguise of a carpenter's garb hide the purple robes beneath from Hebrew eye, not less effectu-

ally did the dark shadow of the ignominious cross conceal the royal diadem that encircled the meek brow of the despised Nazarene from him whose demi-gods achieved their apotheosis by dazzling exhibitions of superhuman prowess. If the inversion of all their expectations smote with leaden weight upon the heart of the Jew, becoming a stumbling-block in his path; not less was the idea of a "Crucified God" calculated to draw down the ridicule of the polished, self-satisfied, sneering Greek, or the haughty and luxurious Roman. The opposition of the Gentile world may have been several shades less virulent, but it could hardly be called less determined. And it was the very *exclusiveness*, which the historian ranks among the causes favoring the rise of Christianity, that fanned the hatred into its deadliest glow. Was the Queen City to suffer dictation? Was she obediently to empty her Pantheon, driving her gods from their ancient abode? Without much reluctance she might have added a niche or two that would hardly have been noticed among the many; but when bidden to cast earthward the occupants of all, and enthrone in their stead a Deity that absolutely prohibited the making an image of Him, she listened a moment stupefied with amazement, and then uttered one prolonged yell of defiance and wrath that shook the arches of heaven until Constantine's Labarum led the victorious legions. Polytheism did not quietly lay itself down and peacefully expire as soon as a purer religion stepped upon the stage, but summoning to its side the embattled hosts of hell, it fought for supremacy with the desperation of the hopeless, and the craft and malice of the damned. If the antiquated mythology had in some degree lost its hold upon the votaries of Zeus and Jupiter, these votaries were not thereby turned over as fields ploughed and harrowed, ready for the scattering of the good seed; but rather, like exhausted soil fit only to produce briers and weeds, abandoned to the occupancy of those demons, Indifference and Skepticism.

Perverted Judaism and rampant paganism were, after all, but two manifestations or incarnations of the one invisible opponent, human sinfulness, which must now be arraigned before the bar of our judgment. Sin, it does not need to be said, was the great antagonist of the truth, and fallen humanity is wofully sinful. Humanity had bestridden vice, and careered through the world for centuries, and may have suffered from the fatigue incident to

such a chase; but was it in the humor to leap from the saddle and buckle on the breastplate of Christian warfare? Jaded, disappointed, sick, would it not rather seek the couch of indolence, or the exhilaration of continued motion, content that it be downward, so long as speed and ease were assured? Ancient philosophy, or modern, never made a greater mistake than in imagining that knowledge is the one all-sufficient remedy against sin. If the great sages of Athens erred conspicuously, it was in advocating this superficial notion. To the believer, at least, such a notion is utterly untenable. To say that man at first sinned through ignorance, is to lay down the whole responsibility of the fall at the doors of Heaven. He yielded to temptation, not because he did not know that he was being enticed to wrong-doing, but from lack of determination to resist the strong craving he permitted to arise in his soul. If, in his innocence, man admitted vice into his bosom, it is hardly possible that pure disgust at the conduct, and impatience of the influence, of the guest should result in the expulsion of that insidious tenant. Let a thoughtful person survey carefully the Rome of Augustus, and then declare to us where in that slough of all abominations he discovers the promise and potency of reform. Had St. Paul gone to the Rome that trembled at the advance of the Punic champion and yet publicly thanked the general that did not despair after the field of Cannæ, such a scrutiny might be conducted with some hopefulness; but now, after two centuries and a half had elapsed from that heroic epoch—centuries of almost uninterrupted decline; now that valor, and discipline, and integrity, and frugality, and manliness had forsaken degenerate Rome, wrapped in a gorgeous mantle that only served for a time to withdraw attention from the mummy within, what possibility is there that the shorn Samson will arise and shake himself with any valuable result? In bigoted Pharisaism, in Asiatic softness, in Roman effeminacy, and in Grecian pride of intellect, Christianity encountered the worst forms of wickedness; tyrants which held their slaves in such abject bondage that very few indeed could hope to escape by their own exertions the hideous progeny of Sin and Satan, whose devilish strength would certainly have overmastered any religion that did not come against them armed with superhuman strength infused by the One who commissioned it to go forth and subdue the world.

And now let it not be thought that we have laboriously de-

monstrated that the new religion could not succeed. We have indeed striven to show that it could not have prospered as it did, had it depended upon natural causes alone. Beautiful and complete as its doctrinal system is when once accepted as true, it has certain features indicative of supernatural strength and derivation which prevent its ready acceptance. The grandeur of the Incarnation, the unutterable love displayed in the Atonement, and the marvelous exhibition of power in the Resurrection move so high above the level of ordinary thought that the natural mind falls back stunned and incredulous from the attempt to believe them true. Far removed as are these facts from common experience, so far above the commonplace must be the means by which they are proved. To the Israelites Christ came fulfilling the minute predictions uttered by their prophets hundreds of years before. This mode of convincing the children of the Law, He Himself stamped with the mark of special approval by His method of instructing the two disciples on the road to Emmaus. To Jew and Gentile, indifferently, He gave the persuasive evidence of miracles, communicating the power of working these signs and wonders to His followers. The divine perfection of His own character and the superior virtue of His disciples afforded additional testimony to the verity of His teaching. But above all, the active coöperation of the Holy Spirit with the evangelist in his efforts to convince and persuade was indispensable in breaking down the barriers of sin, and melting the hardened heart, and convincing the prejudiced understanding. Not prophecy, nor miracle, nor manifest holiness, nor persuasive preaching was able to produce any deep and permanent impression upon hearer or spectator, unless the Almighty Spirit went forth over the assembly in pervading influence and prevailing power, not destroying man's freedom of mental operation, it is true, but modifying it as a very lovely song modifies the play of emotion, or as proffered skill alleviates the diseased action of the physical system. Yes, let the doctrine be the product, not of the best human wisdom, but of the divine mind itself, and ever so well adapted to meet the desires of the spiritual nature, yet could it never have stricken its roots into the subsoil of this planet, though propped by whatsoever strength of testimony, had not the heavenly Dove itself brooded constantly over the fragments of a ruined world, bringing order out of chaos, and fertility out of utmost barrenness.

Nevertheless the Paraclete works largely through *human agency*, and employs *natural causes*, so that when once we have duly ascribed to God the honor that belongs to Him, and protested with becoming vehemence against the rationalizing process that robs Him of it, we may embark courageously upon an inquiry which is not without its importance, Why did the Church grow so much more rapidly in its infancy than it has ever done since? Can it be that it soon attained its prescribed dimensions, and then became stationary in size as the full-grown man is? Not so, for the Church was given a clear and comprehensive title to the length and breadth of the earth.

Undoubtedly, a remarkably rapid immediate expansion was provided for by the Master Himself; and this in two ways that command our attention. First, the Lord effected this by supplying the Church with a devoted band of missionaries trained under His own eye, and endowed with an adequate measure of divine grace for the special emergency; and secondly, by arming these early preachers with extraordinary control over forces, laws, and even persons, both of the natural and of the supernatural universe. Still the rate of the Church's progression subsequent to this era was such as to have been unexampled since, except in a few cases separated by long intervals. Curiosity and the love of useful knowledge both urge an examination of the causes of this quick expansion.

Of the three marked features of the infant society which most powerfully conduced to this fortunate result, the first that we shall notice will be its *admirable organization;* which at once, by its democratic character, called into play the best energies of all its members, lay as well as clerical, and by the autocratic power of the episcopate directed these awakened energies surely, unostentatiously, and promptly into the proper channels. Defective execution is said to be the characteristic vice of democracies; these consequently often resort to the expedient of appointing a temporary dictator in order to insure the concentration and vigor which are necessary in the conduct of a campaign. The cause of the Gospel must have equally suffered from diffusion of authority had the pristine organization really been the democracy some would make it; and the reason it did not languish and die was that every missionary enterprise had a single head to manage its affairs. In the dispute of Paul and Barnabas we see that even two controlling wills were not as good as one so soon as the band

numbered more than two persons. The mother Church accordingly was soon put under the rule of James, while the Apostles generally went out singly, founding churches here and there, and establishing each after the invariable pattern which we behold at Ephesus, with Timothy at its helm and the requisite number of presbyters and deacons under him. Thus unity of design pervaded all the efforts of any given church. The bishop, consulting with his college of presbyters, decided what line of action should be adopted, and then himself directed how that should be carried out, appointing to each subordinate his own station and charge in garrison and field. Thus by concerted action was individual energy made to tell most effectively upon the foe, who, instead of being able to practice the tactics of the surviving Horatius, was compelled to face a compact and disciplined enemy.

Again, in those happy days, all who "ran" were "sent" by the same authority, so that when one "company of preachers" had made some progress in converting unbelievers, another did not come upon the scene, thinking it their bounden duty to overturn all that had been accomplished and establish a new sect if not another Christianity, and thus thoroughly confusing the neophytes, and drawing from them the uncomplimentary exclamation, Behold how these Christians abhor one another! Evidently such conduct on the part of missionaries *may* not only be laudable but absolutely necessary; since that heresy and schism already occupy the ground, is sometimes all the stronger reason that truth and unity should forthwith assert their claim to universal allegiance, inasmuch as error may be more fatal than ignorance; and when the duty has been put upon the Church of preaching the glad tidings everywhere, she may not shrink from its performance on the plea that others have done the work imperfectly and mistakenly. Still such hostile presentations of the Gospel of peace and love must have an injurious effect upon those to whom they are made, and strongly tend to render them callous to the moving appeals of the religion of the Crucified. They may be either so contradictory as manifestly to be mutually destructive, or so similar that nice discrimination tasks itself to distinguish between them: in the first case the untutored intellect, not skilled in the combats of the schools, will refuse to believe in the divine descent of a religion that leaves its votaries so deep in the fog that they hold mutually destructive views of its most important doctrines

and mysteries; and in the latter, the savage heart will fail to be impressed with the loveliness of a rule of life which seemingly permits its subjects to retard the great work of regenerating the world, by spending their time and exhausting their energies in wretched quarrels about minor differences. The pernicious influence of such bickerings as are common among rival denominations, is sure to be even greater upon those souls which are already committed by the memories of a lifetime to the course of persistent rejection, well furnished with arguments against the Church's faith and order, and animated by the deadly hatred of the truth which the father of lies especially infuses into those who, having enshrined much truth in a larger amount of falsehood, call the whole by the name of the smaller portion. Savage and civilized alike, unchristianized mankind bars the portals of its heart against the entrance of contending emissaries, very properly waiting for some certification that, once admitted, they will not continue the unappeasable strife, carrying havoc where they should sow brotherly kindness and charity. Much as the early herald of the Cross had to contend against, he had not to dread an attack in the rear. His foes were all in front. He might be starved, plundered, beaten, imprisoned, burned, torn to pieces, crucified, but not stabbed in the back by his own brethren. The missionary enterprises of the Church, till Arius set up his seditious standard, were backed by the whole moral force of the Lord's army, and consequently flourished and grew like the mustard-seed of the parable.

Lastly, the fold of Christ in apostolic, and in all ante-Nicene, times was girt with a wall of fire, through which all must dart who would seek refuge within. Lit by its enemies, this barrier served as a most effectual protection to the Church against the inroads of such as would have proved themselves false friends and ready betrayers. In all periods she has had no worse foes than her own disloyal children—*disloyal* because all sin is rebellion against God and His Only-begotten Son. Men do not judge a fruit-tree by its size, shape, bark, or leaves, but by its fruit; so, rightly or wrongly, they decide upon the merits of a Church, not so much by the number upon its rolls, by the character of its doctrine, by its form of worship, or pureness of descent, as by the success it seems to have in molding the lives of its adherents into uprightness and piety. A wicked member can do more positive injury to a Church than a hundred assailants. In freedom from

the pollution, reproach, and harm brought upon an organization by unruly members, the primitive Church was peculiarly happy: for this she has to thank the brutality of Nero, the policy of Trajan, the honest abhorrence of Decius, the criminal weakness of Diocletian; or rather the God who makes all things conspire in advancing the welfare of those who love Him, and converts the weapon of the persecutor into a shield for the persecuted. Great sinners unquestionably harassed a communion into which they had intruded, or from which their backslidings should have constituted them self-expelled, as far back as Judas; but they do not seem to have disturbed it in any great numbers, and were promptly subjected to discipline, so that the body might be delivered from scandal. Bad as may have been that Corinthian Church, which was so severely rebuked by its Apostle, its average morality must have been immeasurably above that of the surrounding heathen population wholly surrendered, as that was, to lasciviousness and universal excess. If it lacked something of the perfection evolved by eighteen centuries of continuous Christian civilization, Porphyry or Julian could hardly cast up against the despised sect a deficiency measurable only by a standard of which they did not dream. The Gospel net inclosed good and bad then as well as now, but the opposers lashed the surface with such fierceness that most of the latter were frightened away and driven beyond soundings. Wheat and tares in those days were seen growing side by side, but greater care than now was taken to eradicate the latter as far as prudence allowed. Discipline was administered with a fearlessness that knew no restraint but that of anxiety to reclaim the erring. Trusting her cause to God, and careful for nothing save to retain His favor, the struggling Church of the first three centuries scourged her sons, when she thought they needed it, with merciful, but impartial and unsparing hand. Instead of indolently and faithlessly suffering them to run on from bad to worse, imperiling their own hopes of salvation, and bringing endless disgrace upon their negligent parent; or only checking them with the *voice* of admonition, so little likely to be heeded by those who most need it, she put herself to the trouble of inflicting upon the disobedient such punishments as were within her power, publicly rebuking, suspending, excommunicating them. This course often resulted in the reform of the transgressors, always redounded to the edification of the rest

of the congregation, and washed in a great measure from the skirts of the Church what stains she had incurred from their contaminating presence. Thus, environed with the barrier of persecuting hatred, and sedulously fulfilling the part of a tender mother, the youthful Church smiled upon the world that sought to slay her, pure, calm, triumphant.

CHAPTER V.

MANICHÆISM.

It must not be inferred from anything said in the last chapter that no counterfeit of the truth obtained currency before the arch-heretic of Alexandria dared to blaspheme the Son of God; yet what might pass for counterfeit coin was rather a professed imitation than a deliberate imposture. As might have been anticipated, the earliest departures from the truth were in the line of Mosaism, being attempts to engraft the new upon the old. Hence arose the effort, so repugnant to St. Paul, of bowing the necks of Gentile converts to bear the iron yoke from which the galled shoulders of the Hebrew were soon to be delivered. At about the same time originated the Ebionites, holding the low materialistic view of the Incarnation which confessed in Jesus no more than a mere man; and its complementary falsehood which was embodied by the Docetæ in the spiritualistic notion that Christ had no physical existence, but only *seemed* to be flesh and blood. These and other heresies of that period left little lasting impress upon the Church or the world, and may be remanded by us into oblivion.

More deserving of our attention by far were certain schools of speculative religion that early flourished outside the Church, without even pretending to belong to it; and therefore were *heresies* in scarcely any truer sense than the Buddhist or the Mussulman could be called a *heretic*. In the Asia of the ante-Nicene epoch three distinct classes of religious philosophy prevailed and disputed with Christianity the homage of man's mind. First, there was the ancient faith of the Hebrew nation, sadly corrupted by unauthorized glosses; then, there were added the dreamy speculations of the Oriental imagination concerning the Supreme Being, the origin of things, and other unsearchable mysteries; and lastly, there entered the arena Neo-Platonism, a

strange conglomerate itself of the various philosophies of Greece and perhaps half a dozen other beliefs, as they had been melted down and run together by the heat of violent contact. Acting seemingly as a most powerful solvent, Christianity reduced all these to their constituent elements, and without intending such a result, adding a few parts from her own substance, gave the world a new mineral, which she herself found it afterwards very difficult to decompose with any re-agents she could apply. Thus was born *Gnosticism*, a most ungainly offspring, itself the fertile parent of numerous sects. Gnosticism exercises unbounded liberty in stocking its Pleroma with superhuman beings, which it causes to emanate from a dualistic source, and dubs *Æons*. This system, or rather this congeries of systems, it was which gave so much annoyance to the youthful Church, and drew the fire of such men as Irenæus, Hippolytus, and Tertullian, who held up its ridiculous tenets to the contempt of their own and all succeeding ages. These sects seem to have been destitute of vitality. After making considerable noise for a time, they gradually disappear, and then reviving a few times, as in Spain under the name of Priscillianists during the fourth century, die down again and are heard of no more.

More potent and lasting was a sect that arose in the third century at the court of Sapor, the Persian monarch. Having lately escaped from the rather galling domination of Parthia, Persia had become the scene of much revolutionary movement. An earnest attempt was made, with partial success, to revive the ancient religion of the Achæmenian court. A religion was made the established creed of the Sassanian Empire which was intended to be the same that had flourished under the former dynasty five centuries before; but into it had really entered many an extraneous element borrowed from alien faiths. Indeed, it is hard to give any specific title to the resulting compound. Zoroastrianism it was not, for that, originally at least, was monotheistic, and this was dualistic; Magian, strictly speaking, it was not either, for that was almost purely a worship of the elements, and this had adopted Ahura-mazda and Angrô-mainyus, and revered those two antagonistic deities besides adorning the mountain heights with picturesque altars to the "Lord of Day." The reviver of this Mithraic cult was Artaxerxes, the restorer of the empire; and to him is due the celebrated sacred volume of the Zendavesta. His

son and successor, Sapor I., was likewise an enthusiastic Zoroastrian. But, though thus given a decided predominance, the faith of the Magians had not driven its rivals from the field. Judaism itself seemed to enter upon a new life in the Talmudic schools of Babylon; Buddhism was known outside of India; Grecian polytheism had not been forgotten; Christianity had made its converts; and many an other system or half-system of religious belief challenged the attentive study of earnest souls. About the year 270 A. D. a certain Manes, of a naturally eclectic mind we may well suppose, having by fusion of these evolved a new doctrine which was more satisfactory than any of them to his judgment or his pride, broached his invention to the monarch, and won his favorable attention for a time, but was soon compelled to flee. He returned under Hormisdas, and was put to death under Varahran, thus completing his public career as the founder of Manichæism in less than five years; a short course to run, but long enough to give the initial impulse to his strange system of half-Christianized Zoroastrianism, an Eclecticism having Dualism for its basis with Christianity patched on as an after-thought. The sect which took his name presently united its forces with those of the Marcionites, Basilidians, Valentinians, and other Gnostic tribes in a sort of partisan warfare against Christianity. Its stronghold continued to be in the East, where it spread over Persia, Armenia, and other countries, till it gathered head enough to excite the animosity of the Empress Theodora, who threatened it with extermination. Rebounding, however, from this depression, it either crossed the Black Sea or followed the curve of its shores, and obtained secure footing in Bulgaria, being now known as *Paulicianism*. Thence, reïnforced by various colonies transplanted by imperial power from Syria and elsewhere into Thrace and the regions adjacent, it penetrated into Italy, and then into Germany, Spain, France, and all corners of Europe, concealing its pernicious doctrines under various names, of which *Albigenses* is said to have been one, and continuing to vex the Church perhaps down to our own day.

Both Gnosticism and Manichæism were rooted in the belief of two equal and antagonistic Beings dividing between them the sway of the universe, but waging deadly warfare for the possession of the whole; a belief very natural to a mind freed by the indolence of an Eastern life for unstinted indulgence of its activity, undisturbed by the necessity of toiling for the means of subsistence;

but, by consequence of this very leisure and of an enervating climate, indisposed and unfitted for the disagreeable and arduous task of restraining the imagination and calling into play the less active, but nobler, powers of the understanding. Reposing beneath the luxuriant foliage of his native land, the meditative Oriental watched the gradual unfurling of those cautionary signals by which nature gives warning of the approaching storm, and wondered why black clouds were permitted to blot out the fair beauty of the radiant heavens, fierce winds to carry dismay and havoc in their train, needless torrents of rain to inundate the blooming fields, to sweep away the labor of the husbandman and the artisan, and to furrow the face of the earth with many an ugly seam. Drifting upon the current of thought, he further asked himself why destruction seems to be the condition of all animate existence, every species only resisting the exterminating wrath of others by an incessant struggle, in which it inflicts in its turn misery and death upon its neighbors; why man's frame is so often racked by pain and enfeebled by disease, and his happiness blighted by grief, disappointment, and malicious opposition; and why the serene face of the spirit within man, bright and pure as it smiles from the nursing arms upon a troubled world, so often changes into the hideous visage of an unclean demon before it returns whence it came. To all this, the true answer is found, not by him who dreams away existence by the bank of flowing stream or in the learned seclusion of the study, but by him who, manfully grasping his weapon, goes forth to bear his part in the strife, and, as muscles harden, nerves grow firm, eye becomes quicker to detect, and heart dilates with that joy of conflict which quenches all sense of weariness, discomfort, and fear, learns the incomparable sweetness of that fruit which none can relish save the true soldier of the cross. To the lassitude of inaction all exertion is misery: to those infected with it, the thought that suffering, and sin, and all the manifold forms of Evil are, or at least may be, missionaries of God is repugnant, impossible, and so they are driven to the invention of a coëxistent Principle of Evil, an Ahriman to offset their Ormuzd. To them the material world becomes a prison-house, in which are enchained particles of Light rifled from its sister-kingdom by the empire of Darkness, and forevermore struggling to be free and reäscend; and the one great aim of life, to assist in this escape by subduing the flesh

through abstinence and mortification. Furthermore, a fatalism will soon be developed which views man rather as the plaything of circumstances, the tool of destiny, or the puppet of superior forces, than as that noblest of created beings, an individual whose own hand writes his history. Wherever the influence of Dualism has been felt, there may be discovered more or less tendency towards these errors.

The obvious result of those kindred religions, Gnosticism and Manichæism, wherever they have introduced any of their leaven into Christianity, is to remove God from the authorship and control of this world; whereupon it becomes His servants' duty to withdraw themselves as much as possible from intercourse with it. Here, at once, is discovered the germ of Monasticism, for if the world is not God's world, let us escape its temptations by flight, and spend our lives in crushing the stubborn flesh. Such was the shallow reasoning of the desert saint, who, abandoning the post at which he had been stationed by Providence, leaving his brethren to bear the brunt of the conflict, and selfishly turning his back upon millions ready to perish, devoted his life, not to the task of elevating his whole nature, but to the impossible one of destroying one part of his three-fold organism. Monkery was essentially Manichæan, having for its root-idea that the ground and the vegetable world, and all kinds of flesh, and all things visible and tangible were created by the Devil, or else (which practically comes to the same thing) have been so thoroughly vitiated and depraved by the fiend that he has now the full ownership and control ceded to him. Woe, then, to priest or bishop who, piously, and devotedly, and obediently laboring to save souls, fights in the thick of the melée. Fool that he is! let him leave these millions to the claws of eternal perdition, and magnanimously shut himself securely within a cell surrounded by leagues of trackless wilderness! The gatherings of the mighty throng for the purposes of praising God in full chorus, and of unitedly petitioning Him to grant the common requirements,—these have no place in a system which must regard all external worship as useless, if not positively hurtful; though it does leave its deluded disciples to the bondage of *lip and knee* service in the privacy of the hermitage. Strange inconsistency! As for the Sacraments, they are not only liable to the same objection on the score of externality, but actually involve the use of water and the

pampering of the body with the carnal elements of bread and wine. Alas, that Manichæism in all its harmfulness should still be rife among Christians! It is centuries now since monkery quailed before the wrath of an increasing enlightenment, but these many years have not uprooted the principle upon which it rested. In one age the idea peoples deserts and forests with communities of solitaries, and in another wraps its votaries in a Pharisaical garb which requires no Nitrian wilds to protect them from the world, through which they stalk like the Ghost of Hamlet's father while they frown with equal sternness upon the vices of the profligate and the innocent amusements of youth. The Puritanism which, blotting God's sun from the skies, recognizes no sanctity but in the unbending austerity of the misanthrope, does it not teach that this world is a land of dreary exile, in which we must not eat, drink, or sleep for fear of being poisoned? In still another age, the same idea, taking advantage of a state of society truly lamentable, instead of insisting that distilleries and saloons shall not sell a vile compound under the name of spirituous liquor, instead of attempting to instill into the popular mind the imprudence of running at a continual high pressure, and the advisability of practicing an universal moderation; instead of thus inaugurating a reform based upon sound principles, commits the marvelous blunder of confounding *temperance* with *total abstinence*, and calls upon all mankind to abandon the production of the grape, and confine itself to the natural beverage, which may be delightful enough quaffed from the bubbling spring, but is most unpalatable and noxious, as it must often be drunk, if drunk at all. In all these manifestations, it is not difficult to recognize the ever-recurring notion that Matter is Evil, not to the man who wrongly uses it, or who does not submit himself to the control of the divine Will, but essentially, and to all.

Contemporaneous with the Bulgarians, Bogomiles, Cathari, Albigenses, and other Paulician sects were the "Brethren of the Free Spirit," who, under various designations, flourished throughout Europe in the thirteenth and the following centuries, and whether lineally connected with the Manichæans or not, held a central doctrine which was the natural outcome of their teachings. Although the creed of these Brethren of the Free Spirit does not primarily concern itself with maceration of the flesh, it is nevertheless born of the same supreme contempt for the visible.

Haughtily spurning the idea that God verbally communicates with man, it unblushingly demands, for all purposes and in all cases, nothing less than a direct intercourse, for the initiated at least, of the human spirit with the divine. When it did condescend to admit the advantage the recorded revelation contained in the Bible might be to the unenlightened, it insisted as strenuously as ever that those who had once received within them the light of the divine illumination, needed nothing to guide them but this same invisible brightness. In thus throwing down the barriers which the same God who created the spirit, soul, and body of man, has erected to protect him against the misguiding influences of ignorance, willfulness, impulse, and fanaticism, they surely did not realize that they had cast away some of the most important restraints from vice; but the rest of the world soon sadly beheld these *purists* (for such they were at first) change into utter libertines. Though the "Brethren of the Free Spirit" have long since become extinct, many a Christian person at this very day entertains the cardinal error of their school, who is as far from intending to countenance licentiousness in belief or practice as he well could be. The fashionable neglect of ordinances, subordination of Church authority to private judgment, and disregard of ecclesiastical censure what are these but different manifestations of the same contempt for matter as being the creation of a hostile power?

As that anti-philosophic sect which was named after Montanus succeeded in drawing down to itself no less a star than the eloquent and fiery Tertullian, so Manichæism boasts the adhesion of the most celebrated of the Latin Fathers. Augustine, however, threw himself at length into the arms of the Church, and remained till death one of its most distinguished ornaments. In defending the Faith from the assaults of Pelagius, St. Augustine wrote treatises which in after ages were much quoted by defenders of that *logical* system of Christian philosophy known as Calvinism. In this connection it is certainly a little remarkable that the illustrious bishop of Hippo was a convert from a sect tinctured with fatalism, from a speculative doctrine which was an elaborate attempt to account for the origin of evil. This scheme had determined that good and evil issued originally from opposite sources and were incurably hostile to each other, the evil being ineradicably evil and in no degree susceptible of improvement or change.

How easy was the passage from this to the doctrine that some souls were created for salvation, and others with a tendency towards an irretrievably downward course; a doctrine which, if not distinctly held by the Saint, yet was at least not wholly discountenanced by him!

And, on the other hand, how easy a transit is afforded us to the Pantheistic belief of the Universalist! If all souls did really come from the realm of Light, and are only wicked so far as they have been *forcibly* overcome by the temporarily triumphant might of Ahriman, how natural to suppose that the final victory of Ormuzd will forever liberate all the captive atoms and restore them to the Being from whom they emanated, and in whom they are then to be once more absorbed! It is not to be disputed that the doctrines of *Predestination and Universal Salvation* are in some respects diametrically opposed; still they meet in the common attempt to wrest man's destiny out of his own hands and make him a cockle-shell driven by the wind, and may very well therefore have had a common ancestry.

Whether a similar pedigree can be found for the wide-spread disbelief in the Old Testament, which now infects the learned world, it may seem presumptuous to decide; and yet to what other quarter are we at once led when we proceed to ask who *first taught* that the Jehovah of the Jews was a different person from the "Father" of Jesus Christ, to thwart whom the Latter sent His Son into the world, with a commission to undeceive those who had been blinded by the Demiurge or Creator, and point out to them the true way of salvation? If Cerinthus was the first, he was not the only one of these numerous sectaries, to advance a theory so blasphemous, in its clear enunciation, that one may well shun all that is likely to leave him in the companionship of those who hold it, and resolve to cling reverently to the Old Testament as indispensable to the proof and clear understanding of the New.

CHAPTER VI.

THE CHURCH AS AN ESTABLISHMENT.

While far towards the rising sun Manes was concocting his diabolical creed, and nearer the centre of the civilized world Cerinthus and Montanus were amusing themselves by drawing caricatures of Christianity, that religion was making steady and rapid progress, growing as the seed sown in the earth grows, unnoticed, unheeded. The time was approaching which should witness the bursting forth from the yielding soil of that tender germ, and its vigorous up-shooting till mankind should stand admiringly beneath its shade. Proclaiming the glad-tidings wherever Jewish synagogue afforded them an audience and an opportunity, or congregation of idle sophists or of the gaping populace could be gathered, daring and enduring everything, carried forward by a zeal which counted it all joy to suffer as the Lord had suffered, directed by divine guidance, and upheld by supernatural comfort, the heralds of Christ crossed mountains, forded rivers, traced their tedious way over the yielding sands, pierced jungles, swamps, fens, and forests, found entrance into city, and town, and village, and hamlet, and lonely hut, preached in jail, prison, or the stocks, and prospered everywhere. Depths of mystery too profound for Athenian philosophers were readily sounded by the simple faith of illiterate countrymen; the certain hope of a happy life in another world charmed the fancy of many a weary pilgrim, laden with sin; and the heroism of taking up and bearing one's cross drew from luxury and pomp many who had courage to follow the course their judgment approved. Seizing upon the great cities of each province, establishing themselves therein, and teaching and admonishing daily those who flocked around them, the Apostles and their successors created centres of influence from which the entire district could easily be operated upon. By these means Tertullian in the second century

could utter his celebrated boast, which, if somewhat tinctured with rhetorical exaggeration, cannot be supposed to have been made without some color of truth, considering to whom the Apology was addressed. Gibbon calls similar language of Justin Martyr "splendid exaggeration," and yet himself shows that it was correct as it would have been understood by those for whom it was meant. Winning its way at first among the fishermen and publicans of Galilee, the new religion soon borrowed two of its brightest ornaments from the Sanhedrim itself, and then enchained the magnificent genius of Gamaliel's greatest pupil. Finding still most ready acceptance among the meek and lowly of the earth, it nevertheless lacked not adherents among the rich, learned, noble, and powerful: the palace itself was invaded, and the throne ceased to frown upon those who refused to offer incense at the established altars. Alexander Severus, influenced probably by his mother Mamæa, was decidedly partial to them, and Philip went, perhaps, beyond his predecessor in favoring them. With the fourth century dawned a new era for the persecuted Church. No longer would she be compelled to hide in catacombs and thickets and upper rooms, no longer must she walk abroad with bated breath dreading a dangerous foe in every stranger, no more need she stoop to the humble language of apology, deprecation, and entreaty. Her dark days have passed. She has asserted her right to recognition. She has won from Cæsar his subjects and his soldiers, and left the Pontifex Maximus to lament over deserted rites and forsaken shrines. She has already laid a strong hand upon the throne of Jupiter, and shaken it till Olympus, and Greece, and Italy tremble as with the shock of an earthquake. The question now is, Shall Rome come down from her exalted seat, or shall she acknowledge the *Nazarene?* He who possesses the confidence of the Christians, he among the numerous contestants for supreme control of the vast empire who shall carry with him the hearty support of Christian voices and Christian pikes, that competitor will snatch the purple. So thought the far-sighted Constantine when the battle of the Milvian bridge had destroyed a formidable antagonist, admitted him victorious into the imperial city, and heaped fresh fuel upon the ambition which had blazed forth amid the legions of Britain. Six months from that date the famous Edict of Milan proclaimed him the patron of Christianity, and made the year A. D. 313 illustrious as a turning

point in ecclesiastical history. This was no more than a proclamation of toleration, giving Christianity no greater rights than Paganism enjoyed: this it was in *form*, but in reality it fell but little short of constituting the former the legal religion of the empire, and pledging the secular arm to the support of that faith which the ruler professed. Certainly the sharp edge of imperial displeasure soon descended upon those who disturbed the peace of the Church by teaching what was adjudged to be heresy; a measure which was wholly unjustifiable according to modern conceptions of governmental duty. Also, in the very next reign, the son of the first Christian emperor is said to have gone the length of enacting against the heathen the very penal laws which had weighed so heavily in former times upon their antagonists; and even if the truth of this report be more than questionable, it is at least sure that he did all in his power to favor the latter, and render adhesion to the ancient system unpleasant at best, if not positively injurious and unsafe.

What brush shall paint the exuberant joy of the Christians when the conversion of the world's monarch at last ended the protracted period of their bondage with such a triumph; or give appropriate coloring to the golden sky of promise which then replaced the ashy clouds that had so long hung fixedly above them, only parting now and again to make way for the red bolt of persecution! If the gallant bark had ridden so staunchly through all the storm, making the while such excellent headway against the raging blasts and furious sea, what could she not accomplish with the trade-wind of public support bending her squared yards and her lofty prow chasing the blue waves as they dance before her? Henceforth the timid need not refrain from openly confessing their Saviour, nor the weak be withheld by mercenary considerations. Missionary enterprise may now be carried on with tenfold success, hampered by no deficiency of money, for Rome's favorite can never want for silver. Temples will now arise in every city, attracting multitudes by the beauty of their architecture and the grandeur of their worship. Heresy, schism, skepticism, and ungodliness will faint and fall before the majestic countenance of the triumphant Church. Such must have been the visions which, like lovely flowers, sprang up everywhere behind the rumor of this wonderful change in the imperial policy; and who cannot sympathize with those who plucked them? Were

not all nations to become the kingdoms of the Lord and of His Christ? Were not kings to become nursing fathers of the Church, and queens her nursing mothers? If the Church was God's Church indeed, why should not the powers of the earth take it under their protection and do what they could to promote its interests? If all the people of a nation owe allegiance to the Christian's God, why should they not pay this debt civilly as well as religiously; or, under the other theory, if the supreme ruler is God's representative, why should he not administer public affairs with chief regard to the welfare of God's children? Thus Scripture and reason appeared to conspire in pointing out this as the most auspicious event that had occurred since the Church's infancy. Men crowded upon the deck and, as they watched the foam glide rapidly past, and lifted an occasional glance to the clouds of white canvas, unconsciously strained their eyes to catch a glimpse of the port towards which the good ship was bounding.

Alas! All too soon the clouds gathered, and the sea rose so that the vessel labored even more heavily than before. That pride of canvas was swiftly diminished by the reefer's hand, or torn into shreds and borne away on the gale. Men forgot to look for the harbor light. Wherein the expectations so sadly blighted were wrong may be hard to ascertain theoretically, and yet this point of abstract justice deserves to be considered, Can any nation make laws favoring any particular religion without trespassing upon the liberties of its subjects? It is indisputably an inalienable right of man to choose his own faith. If this faith obliges him to offend against his neighbor, of course to that extent its exercise must be restrained by any well-ordered government; but otherwise he has an unlimited right to believe any inconsistency, folly, or blasphemy he sees fit to adopt, and no brother man can call him to account for so doing. Nor is it apparent why a collection of men has any better right to do this than a single individual would have. It is a poor rule which will not work both ways. If because a large majority of the population is Christian it has a right to put obstacles in the way of enjoying another religion, then when that other religion gains the supremacy it has the same right to place restraint upon Christianity. Julian or Constantius was as much justified in striving to put the Catholics down, as Constantine or Theodosius, in endeavoring to suppress paganism. If Christianity ought to burn a mosque simply because it is a

mosque, then Mohammedanism should fire every church it can reach. We Christians complain bitterly when our mode of worship is forbidden, crying out that we ought to be protected in worshiping God according to the dictates of our own consciences. What excuse then can we give for our unfairness in telling the Chinese immigrant that he must pack away his Josh and send the hideous thing back to his own land? Christianity, we are told in reply, is true, and all other religions false. True, but are we Mussulmans to convert unbelievers with the sword, or Inquisitors to burn their bodies for the good of their souls? But cannot a religion be *established*, that is, be the authorized religion of the State, without going these lengths in oppressing others? In theory, of course, it can. It may be only so far the public religion, that its forms are observed in public ceremonies, its property exempted from bearing public burdens, its officers guaranteed the unmolested execution of their functions, and its adherents distinguished by peculiar privileges; while every other is free to exist and propagate itself as best it can. In much the same way a particular medical school might be countenanced by the government, and exclusively employed by it, and yet another perhaps have no cause to protest against a partiality which left it free to sustain itself if it could. The difficulty in all such cases is that, human nature being what it is, a predominant party will always take advantage of its good fortune to domineer over its rivals.

A philosophic mind might have foreseen certain inevitable results of a coalition between Church and State. History bears witness that one of the earliest consequences was an interference of the civil power in the doctrinal disputes of the ecclesiastical; an interposition which seemed, perhaps, rather beneficial than otherwise, while it ranged itself on the side of the Catholics and confined itself mainly to restraining undue ardor in discussion; but became decidedly the reverse of agreeable as soon as the monarch's theology ceased to conform to that of the received doctors, and impelled him to uphold the Arians and drive into repeated exile the mighty champion of orthodoxy. What could be more certainly, more thoroughly, and more rapidly fatal to the true faith than to have its doctrines settled for it by the fiat of a despot, or in any way to hang upon the breath of civil authority? Yet who could have been so simple, what unlettered peasant could

have entertained such implicit confidence in the single-mindedness of rulers, as to suppose for an instant that Imperial Protection and Patronage would not involve Imperial oversight and Imperial meddling in what did not belong to its province. Another result would be that worldly aggrandizement would soon encroach upon the primitive lowliness of the ministry, defacing sadly the pure countenance of God's ambassador. A prelate of more than ordinary ability, of fervid eloquence, of great administrative power, and of winning address, swaying with absolute control the populace of a great city or of a whole province, and with almost unlimited wealth at his disposal derived from the spontaneous offerings of the people, was in a position to bid defiance to the government, or else to be its valuable auxiliary. An emperor who sat insecurely upon the throne, which he had obtained by open force, or secret assassination, or liberal use of money, or audacious effrontery, as so many an emperor did, would be ready to court, flatter, and *reward* the bishop, archbishop, or patriarch who would forge for him the thunderbolts of ecclesiastical protection. And what bishop would be so regardless of the opportunities thus afforded him as not to improve them to the utmost, for the benefit of the great cause, if not for his own individual advantage? Then, too, the legitimate sphere of the priesthood would furnish many facilities for wresting from a conscience-stricken prince, anxious, perhaps, that his misdeeds should not be made known to discontented subjects, or fearful that the balance of the great Account might not be in his favor, gifts of money, lands, titles, and prerogatives. And who could say that the spiritual adviser, who counseled the royal penitent to be liberal towards the Church, had abused the sanctity of the confessional or the solemnity of the death-bed? In the case of an unestablished Church, or of any functionary thereof, that should creep into the good graces of a monarch, favor of course could be shown and almost unlimited privileges granted, but these could hardly become matters of hereditary right unless conferred by enactment; by the passage of which the condition of not being established would immediately cease.

The evils that arose with the growth of episcopal importance and power were two, conspicuous upon almost every page of history from Theodosius down to our own time. In the first place, the character of those who ruled the Church was *directly*

and gravely lowered. Human nature is very much the same within the Church and outside of it; nor is elevation to exalted station therein any certain guarantee that the person so raised is impervious to ordinary mundane influences. Men who enter holy orders thoroughly self-devoted to the exclusive work of their high calling, and with no thought but to promote the glory of God and advance the salvation of their fellow-men, sometimes permit other motives to find permanent lodging within and then to expel little by little the rightful tenants of the domicile. Is it not too much to expect that a bishop should direct the ordinary affairs of a province, and expend as much pains upon the spiritual oversight of his flock as another whose time is not thus taken up and his attention distracted by the comparatively insignificant anxieties of secular management; or that one shut off from contact with the rough world, and gradually accustomed, during fifty years, perchance, to the adulation, luxury, and pomp of a princely station, should retain the humble-mindedness, unworldliness, and self-sacrificing spirit that may have conspicuously marked his earlier days? And besides that these sources of deterioration would affect the occupants themselves, it is to be noticed that serious evils would result from these high stations being sought by aspirants who had nothing to recommend them except intellectual ability and unscrupulous ambition; candidates who cared not so much for the sheep as for the fleeces, not so much for the temple as for the palace; men so bad at the outset that circumstances had little to do but give scope for the viciousness to display itself, who certainly would have felt little inducement to intrude themselves upon a Church whose poverty was mitigated only by hopes for the hereafter.

In the second place, as soon as the Bishop has been established as a high officer of the State, the Church is no longer likely to enjoy undisturbed freedom of electing to the vacant seat such as she judges meekest and holiest, as well as ablest and boldest, and so fittest to rule in the kingdom of God; but the king or emperor, dreading the independence of some sturdy churchman, or desiring to reward some favorite of his own, will insist that he himself shall have an equal, if not a paramount, voice in the appointment. Also, the ecclesiastical authority will not be allowed to displace such appointees when it has decided that they are neglecting or abusing their powers, but will be obliged to sus-

pend indefinitely righteous sentence against heretical, worldly, and impious dignitaries, because they happen to be useful to the civil ruler. The Church could not tamely submit to such dictation, and see all important stations within her proper gift bestowed and retained at the will of a power more or less opposed to her interest; nor, on the other hand, was it to be expected that a Charlemagne or a Charles the Fifth would complacently behold the territories, fortresses, troops, supplies, and revenues of vast sections pass into the hands of one estranged from the policy of the empire through birth, education, and the tenure by which he held. Hence would and did arise long and bitter strife, from which neither party could recede without endangering its very existence. The famous Investiture Controversy kept the Empire and the Papacy at swords' points for centuries, though nominally it lasted only from 1059 to 1122 A. D. Said the House of Franconia or the House of Hohenstaufen: We cannot suffer this foreign potentate, this haughty, avaricious, ambitious Pope, seated in security on the other side of the Alps, to set up and pull down at his pleasure the first princes of the realm and others who, if inferior to the Prince Archbishop of Cologne, are nevertheless temporal Lords of no mean importance. Else farewell to our independence as a nation, and to all hopes of consolidation, progress, and renown! Far better would it be that we should send an humble delegation to the Sovereign Pontiff, and entreat him to take in his own grasp the sword we are too feeble to wield, and relieve us from all further trouble and anxiety in the management of our concerns, the preservation of domestic peace and the protection of our borders from inroads and invasions. Said Hildebrand and those who inherited the prestige with which he had surrounded the tiara, and especially, we may suppose, those of them who successively encircled the original round hat with the three crowns it presently boasted, Nicholas I., Boniface VIII., and Urban V.: Shall the Lord's Anointed derive his title from Cæsar? Shall priest, bishop, and Pope dance attendance in the very exercise of their holiest functions upon one who, if not actually an ungodly person or an unbeliever, is certainly not fit to rule those who are commissioned over the Lord's heritage, in the affairs of that heritage? Shall they to whom all power in earth and heaven has been given by Him to whom it belongs; shall they who have been intrusted with authority to bind and loose on earth

with assurance that their acts shall be ratified in heaven; shall he whose right hand holds the keys of heaven and hell, be designated, installed, deposed by an earthly potentate, the worthless offspring of a degenerate race, the ruthless victor of a dozen bloody fields, or the crafty master of the trickster's art? Out of such a dispute what way was open? One in whose bosom smouldered a single ember of patriotism could not yield his country over to the intriguing of a foreign potentate: one in whose breast lingered the faintest spark of churchmanship would extend himself on St. Valentine's hard couch, rather than consent that those, who have for their function to minister with clean hands at God's altar, should be the satraps of a despot. When patriotism and churchmanship, when duty to one's country and duty to one's Church, come into conflict, what man, who feels himself to be but a pilgrim on this earth, dare forfeit his title to citizenship in the other country by enrolling himself under a hostile banner? Against all usurpations of the Empire, Hildebrand stood firm as a rock and valiant as a lion, through several changes of government and various pontificates, seemingly possessed with the grand idea that he had been marked by destiny as the deliverer of the Church from the unhallowed embrace of Civil Authority. Through many years the fierce strife raged, Henry IV. now ignominiously submitting at Canossa, but soon thereafter triumphing over his antagonist, who became a prisoner in the besieged fortress of St. Angelo until rescued and carried to Salerno by that redoubtable Norman, Robert Guiscard. His death, however, left the Papacy in the ascendant and advancing steadily towards the culmination it gained under Innocent III. It is true that a compromise was made a few decades later, but what substance could there be in such a compromise? It was solemnly agreed between Henry V. and Calixtus II. that thenceforward the ring and crosier should be conferred upon bishops and abbots by the Church, and a sceptre be given them by the Empire, the former being regarded as symbols of ecclesiastical dominion, and the latter as betokening the civil domination confided to their hands; and thus it was to be represented that they held under both powers, from both sources, an authority to be employed for the benefit of both. We cannot say that the Concordat entered into at the Diet of Worms was wholly impotent; though it is not easy to see that it accomplished much more than a transference of the contest from

the battle-ground to the cabinet, for, while the name *Investitures* may from that date occur less frequently upon the historic page, the struggle for universal and exclusive dominion between the two parties goes on with unabated virulence until the blue-eyed race of the North appeared upon the fields of Leipsic and Lutzen.

Thus by the light of history do we perceive how great was the error of Christianity when it mistook the evanescent flashings of an Aurora Borealis for the early hues of dawn. Did she expect that the lion would extend his claws to be clipped? That which constitutes the inherent vice of a Democracy is precisely what makes a union of Church and State unadvisable; men are not what they should be, what they must be before they can be trusted with such freedom as seems commensurate with their noble intellectual faculties, what they never can be this side of the grave unless a millennium is really to precede the final catastrophe. As long as the world is what we sadly know it to be, nominally Christian, but actually unconverted, we cannot expect much of good to come from a close alliance between it and the maiden who is destined to be the bride of Christ. Another sad mistake she made, if she thought to increase her influence and importance by summoning swords and spears to her assistance. How much grander was the triumph of Ambrose, in a day when the Church had hardly begun to feel that she was *established*, than that of Hildebrand six centuries later! Both of these men succeeded in forcing into the position of penitents the most powerful sovereign of their times: in both cases the submission finally extorted was practically absolute. He of Milan employed no weapons but those of rebuke and loving entreaty, while the equally-devoted prelate of Rome enlisted troops and encouraged an usurper. Behold the results! Ambrose's victory was complete, tightening about Theodosius the bands of a willing subjection to the law of love, and adding to the esteem with which the emperor had previously regarded the fearless bishop; but Gregory's incensed and exasperated his royal penitent, who soon appeared in arms against the man who had humiliated him to the extent of compelling him to stand several days bare-footed and bare-headed in the snow, and led on to the inevitable reaction which lifted high its crest when William de Nogaret smote the shaven head of Boniface, humbling the Papacy as perhaps it never has been

humbled before and since that audacious deed of Philip's emissary. Truly, the kingdom of Christ is not of this world; and in proportion as His servants place their reliance upon other than spiritual powers, in that degree will they feel slipping from their fingers that power which He has given them, the sceptre of which is love.

CHAPTER VII.

THEORY OF GENERAL COUNCILS.

SCARCELY has the sun of Imperial favor begun to shine upon the jubilant Church when insidious foes threaten her very existence as it never has been menaced before; but previously to studying the nature of these various heresies that rose against her, it will be best to pause and examine carefully the shield which received and turned aside the deadly weapons of the assailants. This seems the proper place to discuss the subject of GENERAL COUNCILS.

The Saviour of mankind is universally acknowledged to have been, what He distinctly and repeatedly claimed that He was, a *teacher*. His mission was to give men a fuller, profounder, and more perfect knowledge of God, of themselves, and of their relations to God. His was no stammering tongue, but one which uttered with accuracy and emphasis the message entrusted to Him. Lawgivers, priests, prophets, and kings had already proclaimed such fragments of divine truth as they had been able to grasp; but the God-man Christ Jesus, himself the *Truth*, spake as never man had spoken before. The method of His revelation was one that conformed itself to the immediate demands of the occasion. As Christ perceived that the hearts He so easily read needed a particular lesson or were ready to assimilate it, He gave that lesson in plain, straightforward language, careless of the logical arrangement of the schools. We can hardly imagine Him acting otherwise. The Christian mind refuses to picture the Master discoursing, after the fashion of the philosophers, with regularly arranged heads, and divisions and subdivisions, and in the technical phraseology of later times. Why? Because there was no vast, comprehensive, exact system of theology into which every single precept might have been fitted? Certainly that cannot be the reason, for the Almighty mind comprehends, we may safely

say, not only all divinity, but all truth and fact of all kinds whatsoever, in one all-embracing unity of plan. Nor will the devout believer be easily brought to allow that there did not exist the very perfection of method in our Lord's order of producing out of the inexhaustible treasury of His knowledge those injunctions and principles which He intended to leave behind Him. The objection lies not against the existence of method and system, but against the pedantry of exhibiting them. So perfect was the arrangement that none but the eye of Him who made is competent thoroughly to trace it out.

What was possible to the Master was far above the scope of the disciples' minds. They had not, it is true, learned their own lesson by rote; but they must, in a measure at least, teach it to others in that way or run a great risk of leading their pupils off the right track. Man must systematize his knowledge before he can impart it to others, and indeed in order to reflect upon it himself with a view to its preservation and enlargement. What would be thought of the scholar who should soberly argue that it is superfluous, injurious, pedantic, narrow, to systematize our knowledge of the heavenly bodies, of the successive layers of primeval rock beneath our feet, of the ferns, mosses, shrubs, and trees of our forests, of the prominent events and mighty convulsions that have marked the different eras of the world's life, of the varying phenomena of the ever-acting human mind? Would we believe the person sane who should insist that the cause of science would be best subserved by allowing what we know in these several branches to lie strewn about in promiscuous confusion? What is knowledge but the comparing of kindred facts, or the dissecting of one great fact into a number of small ones which we label and place in their appropriate pigeon-holes? How do we acquire knowledge but by systematizing? If religion is folly, if it is the dream of a bewildered fancy, then let us not disturb it with our logical processes; but if it is wisdom, if it deserves the sober attention of an intelligent mind, let us hold it up to the light, examine it on all sides, apply to it every proper test.

As soon as the infant Church possessed a mind capable, by reason of scholastic training, of forming a *system of theology*, that great work was begun. Saul of Tarsus, bringing to bear upon the new revelation the trained acuteness of a ripe intellect, immediately commenced to compare, and combine, and analyze, until

he evolved the theology which guided his preaching throughout his entire ministry. If a definite and logically-exact system does not underlie the argument of the Epistle to the Romans, it may be boldly affirmed that no human intellect has ever yet shown itself equal to the sublime undertaking of evolving systems of anything; but that all which are dignified with that term are utter shams.

As long as any opinion or belief is unquestioned it is very likely to remain vague and indefinite. If astronomer, geologist, or metaphysician advances some new theory, he may for a while neglect to examine its limitations with great minuteness, and content himself with a general idea of its size and configuration (so to speak). Before long, however, some rival scientist or philosopher, or the common sense of the people, will begin to scrutinize, doubt, perhaps deny. Now, unless our theorist is able to describe and establish the metes and bounds of his theory, it will fare hard with him and his notions, so that he will soon wish that he had not been so rash in advocating an untenable hypothesis. What would the world think and say of the man who, finding himself in this predicament, should raise his hands in deprecation of such harsh treatment, and beg mankind to accept his theory with unquestioning faith? The world's sense of politeness would hardly restrain it from bursting out in a shout of derision. The world will not listen to any teaching that cannot support itself by plausible reasoning; and indeed it would not be able to act differently if it wished. Mankind at large may use a very imperfect sort of logic, may take a great amount of its belief at second hand from those to whom it looks up as leaders, may not be very capable of pursuing an elaborate argument, may fall into numerous and gross errors; but still it must at least *imagine* that right reasoning sanctions its conclusions and its conduct. Call this the thralldom of logic, if you will; but reflect at the same time that the only way of emancipating us from this thralldom is to dethrone reason and make lunatics of us.

Religion is not exempted from submission to the same law. So long as the whole Faith, or any particular thereof, was not examined too closely, it might, without great immediate danger, be held in a disjointed, misty fashion; but the moment men began to apply to it the searching test of the microscope and the crucible, it became necessary to mould the doctrines into well-rounded

forms, and fit them all together into one compact whole. It would never have answered to warn people from meddling by setting up a huge sign, Hands off; for there was no power to compel obedience to such a command, and the hands would have forthwith proceeded all the same to pluck, and tear, and pull in pieces. What good would have come from bidding Arius to refrain from sounding depths which it might, mayhap, have been more reverent and prudent not to try with the plummet? What would have been the result, either, had the Church resolutely remained silent in the great crisis and left the faith to shift for itself? Does it require great strength of sight to see that, if Athanasius had not wielded the weapon of logic with masterly skill, Arius would have won the day and foisted in his spurious tenets as the true and ancient faith of the Church?

Besides, even had no attack ever been made upon the old and simple, faith, had for instance no deadly errors ever been disseminated concerning the wondrous Incarnation of our Blessed Lord, would there not still have existed most excellent reasons for casting the different teachings He had given His disciples into a systematic form? In the effort which every pious mind is bound to make for as thorough an understanding of all God has been pleased to reveal as it is capable of compassing, how shall it escape the inevitable tendency towards theorizing and systematizing? The uneducated are not so entirely under this necessity as those are who have been trained into habits of consecutive thought. Coleridge discovers in this difference a most vital distinction between the two classes of people, remarking that one of the chief advantages of education is that it both enables a man to foresee the end from the beginning, and to advance towards the achievement of his clearly defined purpose by a series of regular approaches, either through the clauses of a sentence or the sustained march of a labored discourse. If the scholar, improving the opportunities afforded by the silent watches of the night, and impelled not improbably by the heavy hand of the Lord upon him, undertakes the contemplation of any fact in the history of redemption, must he not of necessity view that fact in its bearings upon all cognate facts? Say that the incident before him is the Baptism of Jesus, can he help asking himself what authority John had to baptize, what relation that baptism of repentance bore to the kindred rite of circumcision, why the Lord humiliated

Himself so far as to seek such a "carnal ordinance" at the hands of His forerunner; what the dove was, whether the divine nature of the Son, the Holy Spirit, or a mere emblem; what was the result of the rite with its accompanying incidents, whether the man Jesus then became divine, whether He was united then with the God Christ, or whether there ensued merely an influx of heavenly grace upon one who previously was incarnate God; what was the significance of the voice from heaven; what was the mode of administering the rite; did Jesus then become known to John as the Messiah? Some of these questions very likely would not readily suggest themselves to a devout mind; but many of them unquestionably would occur to any inquiring intellect, and refuse to retire until they had received respectful attention; which scrutiny and study would open many an avenue of investigation into other truths, facts, and principles. In the light of these considerations, the platform of opposition to *systematic theology* seems a very strange one to occupy.

If any reader is not yet convinced of the importance,—of the absolute necessity,—of having defined doctrines, let him put himself in the place of the teacher, and imagine himself trying to impart to heathen people, or to the children of the Church, a competent knowledge of Christianity, and forbidden all the time to employ that methodical arrangement without which no one is supposed to attempt the instruction of even pupils in the primary class. He is permitted to teach facts, but must not explain those facts; or if he does embark upon an occasional explanation, must not go outside of Scripture: he is permitted to teach that Christ died for the sins of the world, but may not, upon pain of condemnation, remind his class that the Saviour was both God and man,—man that He might die, God that His death might be of infinite worth; for this is to *dogmatize*. It is difficult to see how the public or private instruction of catechumens and communicants ever could have been conducted without something approaching a systematizing of what was to be taught.

The most violent opposition to *dogmatic theology*, at the present day, comes from the ranks of those who are sworn opponents of Christianity itself. It is too evident to need more than the bare statement that by leaving truth undefined you make way for the encroachments of error. While any given doctrine of the faith is left vague, it is easy for those who wish its overthrow to pretend

that their perverse rendering of that doctrine is the true one; but as soon as a clear, well-rounded logical formula has been imposed upon the doctrine, the most illiterate can generally see that the fictitious teaching is not the true one. A very numerous class of persons, particularly among the devotees of science, men who, it is to be feared, have not taught themselves a proper deference for the manifested will of the Most High, is to be found willing enough to patronize Christianity provided they can remodel it to suit their own fancies. If they are only permitted to dethrone Jehovah and elevate into His seat an impersonal, unfeeling, indifferent, blind Cause; to take away our Lord Christ and give us in His stead an amiable, effeminate, not overtruthful man; to remove from our midst the Holy Spirit and plant in His room a sort of pythonic inspiration; if they could only be courteously suffered to forget the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Resurrection, the Ascension, and final Judgment; if they might only laugh at the Church of God as an effete institution of the Dark Ages, and substitute for the sacraments of God's appointment such devices as may happen to please their ungodly pride; these persons will gladly call themselves by the name of Him who died to redeem them from the terrible and eternal penalties consequent upon their vicious and froward courses. Doubtless such persons are bitter enemies of definite teaching. Others, shocked by the spectacles which Christians have often made of themselves in the quarrels and wars which have grown out of disputes about religion, and oblivious of the fact that everything worth possessing must often be the subject of contention, and that contention is very liable to degenerate into unseemly strife, think that all this unpleasantness would be avoided by destroying dogma. These surely have not computed the cost. It is likely enough that the bickerings about matters of belief would be terminated by the application of such a remedy, but about in the same way that the cholera in a human patient would be destroyed by administering a strong dose of prussic acid. Others again, not endowed by nature with superabundance of mental energy and deficient perhaps in actual power of brain, perplexed by the intricacy, multiplicity, and profundity of the problems which entangle them whenever their feet tread the arduous paths of theological learning, heartily wish that these difficulties were all removed, and are apt to exclaim that they must have been put in the way by the Evil One. It might not be amiss to

remind such objectors that divine Providence did not intend that men should win the crown of life, or indeed any other reward down to the laurel wreath, without shaking off indolence, and putting forth whatever strength, and employing whatever skill, may be at command. The largest class of all, possibly, inherits the prejudice against dogmas from those who have gone before, and only needs to be aroused to thought, in order to be convinced that these are a necessity to any religion that does not mean to be driven to the wall by the leagued forces of ungodliness, infidelity, and headstrong inquiry.

When it has been thoroughly sifted, much of the opposition to doctrinal or dogmatic religion will be resolved into an animosity, not against doctrines and dogmas in themselves, but against the arbitrary and arrogant way in which they have sometimes been imposed upon the faithful. If an authority usurps prerogatives which do not belong to it, or exerts those which it does possess tyrannically, the natural consequence is that by so doing it prejudices even a good cause. Where then resides the power of establishing dogma? To exercise this authority properly will be required scarcely less knowledge, prudence, and skill than to reveal a new religion. To define the doctrine of the Incarnation, or to reconcile Faith and Works, fully, accurately, and authoritatively, is a task to which the unaided human intellect is just as incompetent as to discover the doctrines themselves in the first instance; upon the principle that it is as impossible for an aëronaut to steer his balloon as far as our satellite, which is only a few thousand miles off, as to anchor it among the boulders which may be supposed to lay strewn upon the frozen surface of Neptune: he is utterly and absolutely unable to do either. This is equally true of the isolated divine and of the assembled conclave: all conclusions, opinions, beliefs, affirmations of the individual or of the multitude partake of human imperfection, consequently may be erroneous, and therefore cannot bind any one's conscience. It cannot really alter this undeniable truth that the person or persons in question are unusually and indisputably honest, pious, humble, intelligent, learned, and judicious; for at best, or worst, they are *men*, and no more than *men*, and as men are extremely liable to be mistaken. Of course, much deference would be due to the deliberate decisions of a large body of sober theologians. Still, every one would have a right to go behind the record and exam-

ine into the arguments and evidence for himself, and to differ to any extent from the conclusions reached, if his own mind led him to do so. Whatever weight might be attributed to the determinations of learned Christian scholars backed by the approbation of the masses, and however successful these might be in keeping the wheels of the Church in the right grooves, no blame would attach to the independent thinker who permitted himself to prefer his own deductions to theirs.

The analogy of the divine economy would seem to demand something beyond the degrees of certainty and authoritativeness that could be attained in any such way. The original revelation was conveyed to us with such overwhelmingness of testimony that doubtfulness or even hesitation is put almost out of the question, except for such as are wholly uninformed as to the facts or willfully blind against their admission; furthermore, it goes abroad into the world with this sanction, Believe and ye shall be saved; disbelieve and ye shall be condemned. Having taken all conceivable pains to convince the world, through prophecy, miracle, and transcendent holiness of life, that He was indeed the Son of God and His message unalterable truth, and then having made the acceptance of His teachings obligatory upon all that should know of them, is it in accordance with the harmoniousness of plan always discernible in the dealings of God with us, that He should not have provided some method by which the doubts and discussions which were sure to arise should be settled, with some degree of divine support to uphold the settlement? Without some such method of divine adjustment of controversies we cannot but think that the Christian Church would be less fortunate than the Jewish was with its Urim and Thummin, its Spirit of Prophecy, and all its various facilities for consulting the true oracle; and that we of the present generation are in a far less happy condition than were those favored ones, who lived near enough the time of our Saviour to have some assurance, upon which they could rely, that He was indeed coëternal and consubstantial with His Father —something better than their own logical (or illogical) deductions upon most complicated points from texts of Scripture, which are at least so far contradictory that they present opposite sides of a mystery far above the reach of human comprehension.

At the removal of the Master from earth, the function of guiding into all truth devolved upon that Holy Spirit, whom He dis-

patched thitherward for that express purpose. No Trinitarian Christian of course can doubt for an instant the thorough competence of Christ's Vicar to explain, formulate, and defend the Revelation which, while given by Christ, was just as familiar to the mind of Him who searcheth the deep things of God. Indeed He could, had that comported with the divine scheme, have continued the work of positive teaching, and unfolded to us many a secret which has wisely been left wrapped in darkness. That the Spirit has executed this office is denied by few who even pretend to be believers. That He, in some way and to some extent, acted upon the minds of those who composed the various books of the New Testament and of the original preachers of the Gospel, is universally admitted. That He continues to enlighten the searcher after truth, whether already committed to obedience or only groping after the door, is, if possible, still more generally allowed. But that the same Omnipotent Holy Ghost in any way acts upon the corporate body of the Church, is most unaccountably rejected by large numbers as a figment of a diseased brain. Why does this objection exist and find so much prevalence? Is it based upon a supposed impossibility of such corporate action? Do the rejecters see no way in which the influence of divine grace can permeate a great corporation, and control its action at least in respect of restraint? Is it impossible that the Spirit of God should vivify the whole Body of which Christ is the head, or that vivifying it He should find a way of manifesting Himself or of declaring His mind? No such impossibility exists, nor is the idea of its existence to be for one moment entertained. If Christ promised to send His Spirit to do this precise work, we may be sure that He accomplished His design, and our business is not to discuss practicabilities, but to search reverently for the true method of ascertaining the mind of Christ as revealed by the Spirit.

We need not quarry stone for a foundation already laid. In a former chapter we saw that the Spirit resides, not in the episcopate, nor in the priesthood, nor in the ministry exclusively, but in the entire organization. Unless, then, some portion of the body has been explicitly shut off from participation in this great work of establishing and maintaining the faith, every member is entitled to share therein. Now, so far from any exclusion having been made, we have apostolic warrant for admitting the laity into the highest counsels of the Church. We cannot, perhaps, dem-

onstrate that the "*Brethren*" took any part in the deliberations of the great council at Jerusalem which assembled in the middle of the first century, nor even that the circular letter was issued in their names, since some manuscripts put the word "*Brethren*" in apposition with "The *apostles and elders*," but we can show that "The Church," as something distinct from "The apostles and elders," received Paul and Barnabas upon their arrival at Jerusalem; that "The multitude kept silence and gave audience to Barnabas and Paul;" and that it pleased "The apostles and elders *with the whole Church* to send chosen men * * * and wrote letters by them after this manner;" from all which it appears that the brethren in Jerusalem did have some share in the deliberations of that first council, not only being present to listen and lend dignity to the occasion, closed doors not then being the order of the day, but actually bearing some of the responsibility of its action. And yet that, of all assemblies, might be thought the one least likely to call in the assistance of the laity, enjoying, as it did, the presence of so many especially empowered to guide the infant Church and called by us *inspired men*. Inspired they were, and to doubt the correctness of a decision so deliberately reached by them, and so solemnly promulgated, as having the sanction of the Holy Ghost, in the extraordinary words, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us," would be to cut the ground entirely from under our feet as Christians. Nevertheless, these Apostles did not see fit to rely exclusively upon their own knowledge and wisdom, but unquestionably admitted the presbyters or elders to coöperation. Perhaps they judged that thus their decision would carry more weight and meet with less opposition. Perhaps, in order that the council might be a model for future generations, the Blessed Spirit, until the opinions of the presbyters had been asked and obtained, withheld from the Apostles who were there, both individually and collectively, the kind of inspiration with which at other times He favored them. At all events they did pursue the course indicated above, and with equal certainty they extended the liberty of coöperation to many that were not in the ranks of the ministry at all, and therefore, actually or constructively, to the whole body of the Church at Jerusalem. Now, if *the brethren* were consulted in the Holy City, upon what ground would "The brethren, which are of the Gentiles in Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia," be excluded?

Are they thus shut out? If so, is it not for a reason which never occurred again, namely, because of the presence of the Apostles in this one synod alone? Then, since the principle of allowing laymen a share in legislation is admitted at this council, and fairness requires that all laymen should be consulted if any are, and the one reason for excluding any did not arise again, does it not follow that a circular letter, issued by any second council claiming to be œcumenical, should be consciously addressed to men who can reject as well as accept, who have been taught to prove all things with a view to holding fast that which is good? And how stands it with the letter set forth by this very apostolic assembly? Does it not lay the "Necessary burden" as upon shoulders that have the right to shake it off? That it goes forth in the name of the Holy Ghost may not involve a denial of the right of those to whom it comes to pronounce upon the correctness of that high claim. There is one hypothesis which explains all the facts in the case: whether any other does the same as satisfactorily, or more so, each must decide for himself. The two higher orders of the ministry debate the subject at length, the Apostles, as was fitting, taking the most prominent part; and a decree is at last reached which is couched in mandatory language, not, however, because the decision is yet binding upon the Church, but in anticipation of the time when, by unanimous consent, it will become so. We have a parallel to this in the case of St. James, who closes his speech with the words, "Wherefore my sentence is," etc., not, we may presume, signifying by that expression that he meant to force his own opinion upon the whole assembly, but rather, as president of the council, summing up the remarks of those who had spoken in this one proposition, which he offers for adoption. After the same manner, the council itself sends forth a paper which is decided and authoritative in form, and yet is submitted to the judgment of the churches for their approval in order that it may become law. In opposition to this explanation, it may be held that the decree when passed by the synod was binding and final. Upon what theory, however, shall we rest such a solution of the question? Not surely upon *episcopal prerogative*, for if the Apostles as *bishops* were sufficient in themselves, why were the *elders* consulted? Shall we base it upon the general possession of divine direction by the *priesthood* alone? What, then, becomes of deacons who, like St. Stephen, were full of grace and

power, or, like St. Philip, were even subject to the *corporal* action of the Spirit? What, moreover, becomes of St. Jude's declaration that the faith was once delivered into the custody of the "*saints*"? Furthermore, if the common people had such free scope in electing their bishops that they could seize upon an Italian lawyer and have him advanced immediately to the episcopal throne of Milan, the clergy were in some sense at least representatives of the laity; and the same view of laic rights which conceded this elective franchise would also recognize the justice of a claim to a voice in pronouncing upon the doctrines which all were to believe under penalty of excommunication. It is time to close a superfluous and superogatory work. We are carrying a burden of proof which properly belongs to the other side. When once it has been agreed that the Holy Spirit communicates His gifts alike, though in different measure, to Cornelius and to Peter, to the three thousand and to the Twelve, very clear evidence ought to be exacted before we consent to deprive any Christian, however lowly in station, of the prerogative of bearing witness to the truth as it is in Jesus; and until that clear proof is forthcoming we need concern ourselves no more about the matter.

What is to be sought in order to ascertain the truth in all matters of religious controversy, if our theory be correct, is the testimony of the entire Church, not omitting the humblest member of it; and the problem therefore is how to obtain the desired witness, since it is impossible to convene all Christians in one great mass-meeting for the purpose of voting upon the question under discussion. The only resource then is to refer the matter, by circular letter or otherwise, to the various provinces and dioceses, to be adjudicated by them separately. The object in view will be secured in this way just as surely as though the grand conclave could be held, and with the avoidance of many embarrassments that would attend upon such an unwieldy gathering.

The initiative in such movements belongs of right to the officers of the kingdom. When God's Church meets in solemn assembly to deliberate upon points of doctrine, discipline, and worship, who will so naturally take the lead in the discussions as those who have given their whole lives, and consecrated all their powers, to the work of the ministry, and have been so distinguished by their learning, ability, administrative capacity, and piety as to have been thought worthy of obtaining the honor of the episco-

pate? It is not in the nature of things that ordinary laymen should be *experts* in theology. Occasionally the wonderful genius of some intellectual prodigy will constitute him king in all departments of learning; but in the vast majority of instances a suitor will do well to engage a lawyer, a diseased person to employ the skill of a medical man, and a sinner or a doubter to call in the assistance of a professed theologian. Divinity may be more or less every man's study, as it certainly concerns every man very nearly to have some knowledge of it; yet the thorough mastery of it demands the lifelong, assiduous application of the most powerful intellect.

While hardly any one would be likely to advocate the exclusion of bishops and priests from church councils, it is a moot point whether the laity should have a voice and a vote in their deliberations or not. There was no such representation of the laity in the early councils as we now have, for example, in the General Convention of the American Church; but this difference may perhaps have been due to the character of the times, and principally to the extinguishment of those democratic ideas which had played such a prominent part in the earlier history of Rome. Nor, it may be, were the common people sufficiently educated to take an intelligent share in theological argumentations. The whole question is one of expediency, for, provided the decision of a council is finally ratified by the laity, it is their *voice* equally as if they had had a share in its original passage. Viewing it in this light, we may be allowed to think that with the prevalence of the idea of popular sovereignty, and with the wide diffusion of education and intelligence, has come upon Christendom a certain demand for the admission of the laity to a distinct participation in the legislative and judicial management of its affairs.

Honoring the ministry ever so highly, we must be excused for saying that it is after all a *caste*. Isolated from mankind, possessing interests of its own more or less conflicting with the common interests of the world, looking down from an exalted standpoint upon the struggles of the brethren who are obliged to come in daily contact with the contaminations of evil, given up largely to contemplation of the tremendous realities of another life, it is almost inevitable that the ecclesiastic should, to a degree, forget that he is a man, and come to take a distorted view of a world, and a theology, and a providence, which were intended not for *ecclesiastics* but for *men*. This is only making a particular appli-

cation of the general rule, that every man is the victim of a strong tendency towards sinking his manhood in his trade or his profession. Which being acknowledged, we are ready to recognize one decided advantage likely to accrue from engrafting upon our ecclesiastical synods a non-professional element, which will regard everything from the common ground of universal manhood, and sometimes exercise a most wholesome influence in bringing back to earth imaginations too prone to soar away into the illimitable void, point out obstacles overlooked by a gaze perpetually directed skywards, and even perhaps find it necessary to insist somewhat strenuously upon moral obligations that have been forgotten by a religiousness sublimated to the height of fanaticism. Let us ask ourselves whether our laws would receive any increment of soundness from being devised by a legislature wholly composed of lawyers. Such a law-making body would doubtless shun the inconsistencies which mar our statute-books, and give us a severely logical system of enactments, like that marvelous congeries of estates-tail and contingent-remainders which is known as the English Common Law of Real Property; but would possibly fail to provide the code best adapted to meet the wants of every-day life.

In the case of an *established* church a second consideration becomes prominent here. The persons most exposed to the seductions of that condition, are not those who are hidden in the obscurity of private station, but those whose eminence marks them out as wielders of influence: these are the ones to be approached with promises, flatteries, and menaces, and also the ones to become conspicuous for corruption. If the mighty ruler sternly bids the Church decide that this doctrine is true or remove the anathema from that heretic, the ones to tremble, the ones upon whose unshielded heads will descend the full force of a despot's wrath, are, first of all, the bishops. If the World has so far prevailed over the Church that it has grasped the control, that usurper will not long delay to force into the highest places its pliant, unscrupulous, and shameless tools. Herein lies another reason why the laity should have its voice.

We have held in reserve the most potent reason of all. The drift of all things mundane is towards change: nothing has the gift of continuance. The days, the seasons, the climate, the occupations of men, their constitutions, temperaments, opinions, all

shift perpetually. The *Church* must not change: her faith, dependent upon a closed revelation, must remain stable or become erroneous. This can be effected only by the intervention of deity, but God always chooses to employ instrumentalities as far as possible. Strange to say, the clergy, as a class, are more prompt to close with any new theory or view of religious belief than the flocks over which they preside. In every age certain portions of the faith will attain undue prominence in the estimation of mankind, if for no other reason, because they happen to be most vehemently contradicted: there will, therefore, be a decided, and perceptible, and dangerous current setting towards the shoals, rocks, and cataracts of one deadly error or another, all *extreme* views being necessarily wrong. The clerical mind, dwelling constantly upon these themes, and resting longest upon those which it is obliged to defend from attack, will be much more easily borne along by the stream than the preöccupied brain of laymen who, caring for religion because it has bearings upon practical life with its struggles, weaknesses, perplexities, and trials, rather than as a science, are very apt to take those views of the subject which were taught them in their tender years. In short, the laity are the *common sense* of the Church, corresponding to that faculty of the human mind which is least susceptible of education, which is more than any other the resultant of the mental modifications of ancestors, the sum of inherited tendencies, the great balance-wheel of the system, which can so safely be trusted to reach conclusions that will at least not shame us in the carrying of them out.

An organization which is above all things *conservative*, cannot afford to neglect the very principle of conservatism. It is comparatively unimportant that it should summon the conservative laity to its legislative gathering, but it must in justice to itself consign to them at least the right of veto, the power of checking the too hasty progress of the ministry by saying, This we have not learned from our fathers; this is not the tradition of our Church: there must be something wrong somewhere. In accordance with this rule it is manifest that no council can be pronounced *Œcumenical*, or *General*, beforehand, for no matter how numerous and respectable may be the attendance upon it, its decisions are not the voice of the Holy Ghost, through the Church, till they have been sent down to the various national churches and ratified by them. And, as matter of fact, all those councils which have been

recognized as Œcumenical, have been so upon this precise ground; not, of course, that there was always (if indeed ever) a formal reference and a formal ratification, but that their Œcumenicity always remained in abeyance until (as we would say) the respective constituencies had been heard from. As every eye was upon the assembly, its decrees would be eagerly watched for and closely studied; and if, in course of time, no objections were raised, nor remonstrances uttered, these would be considered to have been tacitly approved, and the council come to be regarded as General. If, on the other hand, strong repugnance should be manifested to their reception, partisans here and there would defend the rectitude of the decisions, but the Church as a whole would be thought to have pronounced them at last *not proven*. Thus Nicæa was Œcumenical, not on account of its containing delegations from all parts of Christendom, but because its creed was approved by the common sentiment of the Christian world; while Rimini has come down to us under the title of a simple council or synod, not from lack of bishops to grace its sessions, but by reason of the final rejection of its determinations by the Church at large.

A wide-spread opinion refuses to rest satisfied with anything less than complete unanimity. Is this opinion correct, or shall we content ourselves with the verdict of a bare majority, or should we look for such a large majority as to amount to a practical unanimity? Whatever weight of authority there may be on the side of absolute unanimity, we must still be allowed the liberty of examining into the subject. Why should such entire agreement be required? The Holy Ghost cannot be supposed to have imparted inerrability to all the members of the Church, good or bad; nor in truth has He ever bestowed such a gift upon any one human being. That the voice of the Church is God's voice, surely does not mean that the utterance of every individual in it is a word from on high! What stronger reason is there for expecting freedom from mistake in the diocese than in the individual? Does a promise to be with the whole Church always imply a pledge to each integral portion thereof to preserve it from error? No more than the assurance given to Hezekiah that his life would be prolonged fifteen years secured the perfect soundness, or even the preservation, of each member of his body. It is very much to be feared that no such unanimity ever existed even in the happiest days of the Church. The Council of Nicæa was probably the

most harmonious that ever sat, and yet two bishops of the number attending, Theonas and Secundus, are condemned along with Arius in the letter of that Synod as given in Socrates' Ecclesiastical History. As a matter of strict logic a bare majority must be adjudged competent to decide or testify. Prudence may require that nothing determined by less than a very large majority should be insisted upon; but it is prudence, and not logical necessity, that places such restrictions. It is indeed well that the utmost caution should be used in defining the faith, lest heresy should accidentally be admitted where it is so easy, by a slight inadvertency, to change important doctrines in vital points, which may pass unnoticed for many years until some unusually acute intellect directs its glance upon them. It is immeasurably better that deficiency should exist in technical statement of the truth, than that additions should be made to the sacred deposit; that some should be suffered to fall short of holding the entire body of doctrine, than that the Church Catholic should be committed to positive falsehood in the smallest particular. Therefore, it may be well that dogmas should be passed only by the "*unanimous consent*" of the Church in General Council and Provincial Synod; but by the expression we may not, with any degree of propriety, mean more than the agreement after deliberation of an *overwhelming majority*.

Is it the business of a council to say what the faith actually is, or what in its apprehension that faith ought to be? Should it confine itself to an examination of the members present as to what has always been taught in their respective churches, to a thorough sifting of the evidence elicited, and to the deducing only of manifest conclusions therefrom, or is it to roam at large through all fields of religious investigation and build up new creeds and systems very much as political platforms are now erected? The work of the assembly will be more modest under the former view of its duties, more brilliant under the latter; safer by far in the first instance, not unlikely to lead astray in the second; arduous and slow if its task is to collate voluminous testimony, easy and rapid if there is little more to do than adopt the elaborate confession of some acknowledged leader; in strict conformity with God's method in revealing His truth when the aim is to ascertain by distinct testimony what He has been pleased to say, more in accordance with the usual procedure of human pride when the

lofty claim is put forward of competence to adjust all difficulties through a strenuous effort of the finite intellect. That the former view was that entertained by the fathers of Nice, is evident from the letter of Eusebius Pamphilus to his diocese as given in the twelfth chapter of Theodoret. We will quote the passage: "The following is our formulary, which was read in the presence of our most pious emperor, and which was fully approved by all: 'The faith which we hold is that which we have received from the bishops who were before us, and in the rudiments of which we were instructed when we were baptized. It is that which we learnt from the Holy Scriptures, and which, when among the presbytery as well as when we were placed in the episcopal office, we have believed and have taught; and which we now believe, for we still uphold our own faith.'" After inserting the creed, the letter continues: "'We positively affirm that we hold this faith, that we have always held it, and that we shall adhere to it even unto death, condemning all ungodly heresy. We testify as before God the Almighty and our Lord Jesus Christ, that we have believed in these truths from the heart and from the soul, ever since we have been capable of reflection; and we have the means of showing, and, indeed, of convincing you, that we have always during all periods believed and preached them.'" Daylight is scarcely clearer than are these extracts in demonstrating that those godly bishops felt themselves tightly tied down in all their teachings to the faith they had been taught by their predecessors, and that they thought themselves bound to shun every innovation as too dangerous to tamper with. Now, if all the bishops of the Nicene epoch held themselves thus restricted, it is not to be doubted that all of the preceding ages had submitted gladly to the same restraint, and consequently that what the fathers testified to in the year 325, was the identical doctrine that had been confided to the Apostles and brethren. It may be simple enough to ridicule the tame credulity of these holy men, but let the rash being who is about to join in the laugh against them, repress the inclination till he has measured his wits with those of Athanasius, the true leader of that council, and by contempt of persecution and of deadly opposition of every kind displayed a heroism of spirit that will justify him in despising men who had courage sufficient to brave everything in behalf of the faith they so loyally accepted. He who servilely receives a religion or a

doctrine because one man, or ten thousand, or a hundred million men believe it, or because his father or his remotest ancestor adhered to it, for such and no stronger reasons, and without thorough examination, deserves to be despised as a slave; but the person who attaches importance to the confluence of a thousand different streams of testimony after the lapse of centuries, and is confident that what a thousand dioceses maintain as the belief originally taught them, and those dioceses scattered all over the world, nor some of them enjoying very close intercourse with those neighboring, must be the very teaching of Christ, he merely acts as a rational man should in not contemning human testimony as utterly worthless.

While, however, these reverend and able men showed themselves mindful of the nature of the trust which was conveyed in those words: "Ye shall be *witnesses* unto me, both in Jerusalem and in all Judæa, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth," they did not abdicate any of the functions of intelligent beings, nor bear witness like automata that were only able to repeat certain forms of words. They did not hesitate to call into play all the nobler faculties of mind, but exercised a liberty of putting different truths or parts of truths together, and drawing from them such conclusions as the laws of thought justified. This was plainly a necessity of the case, since a new heresy must be encountered with a new statement of the truth denied. Upon Arius's asserting that the Father and the Son were not equally God, it became necessary to introduce the new term *Homoöusion*, or *Consubstantial*, into the Creed. The emergency could not be met by the ancient formulary, because the heresiarch was willing to recite that, being able to explain its language in accordance with his own theory. The old Creed did not, it is true, favor Arianism directly in the slightest degree, but might be said to countenance it indirectly by silence on the disputed points, so that the Church could hardly have been free from the guilt of culpable reticence had it not enlarged the time-honored symbol. In contending with heresy two processes of witnessing would be employed. In the first place, having carefully ascertained the exact position of the new teachers, the examiners would be obliged to pronounce respecting that position, whether it coïncided with that of the Catholic Church or not. Having assured themselves that the tenets were incorrect, they must, in the second

place, cast about for a proposition which would safely enshrine the counter-truth. Some proposition would presently meet with general favor: this must then be subjected to the crucial test, be turned over on every side, dissected, exposed to the action of reägents, and unrelentingly cast out, unless, without the shadow of a doubt, it appeared to harmonize with Scripture and Tradition, first to the assembled prelates, and then to that safer tribunal, the common sentiment of the universal body. Is then Tradition on a par with the written record? Does the Faith receive increments from age to age, and grow? Have revelations from heaven been vouchsafed since the Apocalypse closed the volume of the Book with that awful warning? What has been said to justify these questions? Tradition does not presume to stand abreast of Scripture, but takes its humble station behind, and supports it; the Faith does not expand in bulk, but only loses a little of its flexibility as it hardens into the superior robustness of advancing age; and no fresh revelation has been made, unless the defending and explaining of the old may be, improperly, so considered. A certain development has unquestionably been taking place all these ages, but not one in any respect hostile to the celebrated rule of Vincent of Lerins, "What always, everywhere, and by all has been believed that is to be held as the Catholic doctrine." There has been all along one unchanging, comprehensive, Catholic doctrine; but that doctrine has gradually developed outwardly into clearer, more logical, more systematic statement and arrangement. The church of the catacombs believed the Son to be *Consubstantial* with the Father as firmly as did the church of remodeled basilicas, but was not quite so conscious of that fact. The knowledge was in some sense *latent*, and may not improperly be compared to that which a child has of its father's character. Ask the boy what are the distinguishing features of the parental character, and you will be answered very vaguely; but volunteer a wrong description, and note how quickly your mistakes will photograph themselves upon your listener's countenance. The primitive Christians believed in God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost as all equally divine, and worshiped and served them, all and each, as the One, Only God; but they had not thought out answers to all the difficulties involved in this belief, nor learned to say that there are Three Persons in One Godhead. It was not, we therefore see, for nothing that the

Holy Spirit was promised and sent to the Church of God: He became to the great and vast organism the principle of divine life which marks it as a living body, and enables it to fulfill such high and sacred functions as that of defending the faith, and formulating it as occasion requires, and handing down the precious legacy untarnished to the latest generation, sparkling and flashing ever more beautifully as the attrition of error smites away incrustations, and lays bare the true faces of the diamond.

CHAPTER VIII.

COUNCIL OF NICÆA.

One of the most remarkable cities of ancient times was Alexandria. In nothing perhaps did the genius of the Macedonian Philip's greater son display itself more strikingly than in the choice of a site for the great commercial emporium which was destined to be a monument of his fame long after Asia and Egypt should have shaken off the Grecian yoke. Nor was the magnificent city less distinguished as the seat of literature, learning, and philosophy than as a haven of ships and a centre of trade. Speculative philosophy was never carried higher or deeper than in this great mart of ideas. Here was planted the first of those great schools of divinity which exercised such wide and permanent influence upon Christianity from the second century down to the decay of learning. Founded, according to a not very trustworthy tradition, by St. Mark for the instruction of catechumens in the principles and mysteries of the faith into which they were to be baptized, and therefore called a *Catechetical School*, founded at all events in apostolic times, it soon expanded in the direction of that side of it which was employed in training choice minds with more thoroughness than was thought proper to be lavished upon mediocre abilities, till it became the foster-mother of many leading bishops of the Church. In the latter part of the second century Pantænus appears as the head of this school, and raised it to extraordinary renown. Whether, or not, this rapid rise was partly due to an impetus given by the elegant apologist, Athenagoras, who may have immediately preceded him, the upward movement was well sustained during the rule of the celebrated Clemens Alexandrinus, his pupil and successor, who had the honor of educating the most illustrious man that ever occupied the master's chair in that institution, Origen, known as the "Adamantine." Origen had among his hearers Firmilianus of Cappadocia, that one of the numerous

Gregories whom posterity distinguishes by the surname of Thaumaturgus, and greatest of them all Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria. He himself had sat at the feet of Ammonius Saccus, the founder of Neo-Platonism, as well as of the author of the "Stromata," and was a marvelously voluminous writer, editing the Old Testament with many different versions arranged in parallel columns, composing numerous commentaries of various descriptions, and issuing treatises controversial, didactic, and expository. With so numerous a progeny, animate and inanimate, it would be remarkable if the character of such an intellectual Samson had not impressed itself upon the school of which he was the head. Of Origen and of the Alexandrian school it may safely be said that they were not inclined to repress inquiry. Freely discussing all subjects they pushed investigation to the utmost lawful boundary, and showed no greater tenderness in their treatment of religion than of any other branch of knowledge. It need not surprise us, then, if the very central doctrine of the faith was handled with a freedom that was not perhaps far removed from irreverence.

While it is no difficult thing for those who have low and carnal notions of God to believe in an apotheosis of hero or monarch, or to imagine that Jupiter or Brahma has appeared on earth in human form, it certainly does strain to the utmost a mind entertaining the lofty conceptions of the divine nature which are the priceless heritage of Christians, to apprehend the possibility of the intimate and enduring union of the infinite with the finite which shall result in a partial and temporary laying aside of the attributes of the former, and reach a climax in the enduring of a horrible and degrading death reserved for the worst malefactors. The speculative tendency of Alexandria would inevitably lead to the free discussion of this tremendous theme, and to the formation of many a complicated theory respecting the character of the union, and the nature and position of the One who became man that He might die for sinners. Theories of the *Logos* or *Word of God* were indigenous both to Judaism and to Platonism, so that all that was necessary was to transplant these into Christianity, and perhaps slightly modify them. Now, while too little is known of Arius's life to warrant the positive assertion that he borrowed his ideas directly from the masters of the great school, and while it is the reverse of true that his teachings were identical with those of Origen and Clemens, or even very closely allied to them, it cannot

be hazardous to affirm that his doctrine was the natural offspring of Alexandria, bearing so plainly the features of its parent that the very strongest evidence would hardly convince us that it had sprung from any other source than the fountain-head of speculative philosophy; the waters of which are not to be recklessly called poisonous because a stream or two, imbibing the noxious qualities of the soil through which they flowed, exhaled death to those who breathed their vapors.

Early in the fourth century the Church in that great and busy city was presided over by a bishop who seems to have fulfilled the duties of his responsible station with ability and fidelity much above the average. In delivering a charge at some gathering of his clergy, in addressing a synod upon some point under discussion, or, we may conjecture, in preaching to the assembled multitude on one of the greater festivals, Alexander took occasion to define the nature of God the Son with unusual explicitness. Among his auditors was one of his own presbyters, who listened to his expositions with strong disapproval. Prompted by motives into which we will not inquire, this man opposed his bishop without hesitation, and combated his arguments with no little acumen and eloquence. Arius continued to propagate his doctrines in public and private, and soon drew after him many adherents in Alexandria, in other parts of Egypt, and in Lybia, becoming the leader of a very considerable party in the Church, and rising into such notoriety that it was impossible any longer to pass him by unheeded. Alexander convened the clergy from a greater or less circuit on two separate occasions, to advise with them about the matter, and finally excommunicated Arius and his most prominent disciples, dispatching thereupon a circular letter to the various churches apprising them of the measure, and exhorting them not to communicate with the outcast. Nothing daunted, Arius retired into Palestine and busied himself in making converts of men in high place by means of letters. Such astonishing success attended his efforts that two hundred and fifty bishops assembled in Bithynia, and addressed all the others in his behalf, entreating that they would receive the Arians to communion, and require Alexander to do so likewise.

Both parties upheld with firmness the unity of God. The original objection brought against Alexander by his rebellious presbyter, was that he favored that extreme theory of oneness,

according to which Sabellius had taught that there were three *forms* or *aspects* of the Divine Nature, but not three persons, *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost* being nothing more than names of three different energies of the one personality. Receding as far as possible from Sabellianism, Arius maintained that the Son was not only a distinct *person* from the Father, but also divided from Him in *essence*. If the Son was *begotten*, argued he, then must He be posterior in time to Him who begat Him; therefore the former is not coëternal with the latter, but, although He was in existence before the world was made by Him, though He was with the Father before chaos itself was created, still He was not always in being, but "There was a time when He was not" (such was the formula, or, in Greek, ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν); forgetting that the use of the expression *Generation* and its kindred terms is a condescension to man's capacity, and does not at all justify us in drawing all the deductions that would be proper in other cases; forgetting, too, what a *philosophical* mind might have been expected to remember, that the deity is not bound by conditions of time and space, but is wholly *unconditioned*, so that it is perfectly conceivable that God should have been a *father* from the earliest moment (if we may use such absurd language) of His own being. Denying the *eternity* of the Son, he could not well avoid a denial of His *essential divinity*, and boldly advanced to the positive declaration that His *substance* was not the same as that of the Father, being communicated to Him by eternal generation, but that, like angels, He was created by God "Out of things which were not" (ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων εἶναι). Apparently he did not perceive that the all-permeating essence of deity can be communicated without loss, or subtraction, or diminution, the Giver retaining all, notwithstanding that He has imparted it whole and entire. What could have been more radical than an error which touched the nature of God, the power of the Saviour, and the efficacy of the Atonement? What more deadly in its results, than a heresy which robbed God the Son of His honor, and God the Father of the glory which, we are told, accrues to Him from the ascription of praise to His Only-begotten and Well-beloved Son, which took away the value of Christ's redeeming death, and left mankind groaning under the bondage of sin? Shall it be said that because Anselm had not yet answered the question, Why God became man ("Cur Deus Homo"), the Christian world did not know the

difference between a valid and an invalid Atonement, and did not feel its faith shaken greatly by these novel and fatal teachings? Let the convulsive throes that attended the birth of the Nicene formula answer in decisive tones. Well might the Church exclaim, These men are taking away my Saviour, and I know not where they are laying Him! If the Saviour was "Emmanuel," *God with us*, then they who hide from our longing sight His divine nature, do what they can to deprive us of our Lord. This did Arius, for he refused to allow that Christ participated in the essential being of the Supreme. If he or his followers called Him *God*, they always did it with mental reservations, meaning that He was a very exalted creature, higher than any archangel, and enjoying the special favor of the Almighty, but still only a *creature*. How astonishing seem then such words as these of a recent author who has written at length upon this Council (Stanley, His. of Eastern Church): "When we perceive the abstract questions on which it turned (*the Arian controversy*), when we reflect that they related not to any dealings of the Deity with man, not even, properly speaking, to the Divinity or the Humanity of Christ, nor to the doctrine of the Trinity (for all these points were acknowledged by both parties), but to the ineffable relations of the Godhead before the remotest beginning of time, it is difficult to conceive that by inquiries such as these the passions of mankind should be roused to fury"! The learned Dean provokes the comment that sometimes the sailors, millers, and travelers, the drapers, money-changers, and victualers, of whom, quoting from Gregory of Nyssa, he goes on to speak as disputing everywhere, in streets, alleys, and market places, about the Subordination and Origin of the Son, are better theologians, from that natural instinct which discerns relations and consequences, than others whose professional training has too much warped the mind; for they at least saw that a God who is made of nothing, and had a beginning of His existence, is no God at all, and that a religion, which proclaims salvation on the ground that God has ransomed us by His own blood, is a pure fiction, if the one who made the atonement was divine only by figure of speech or by courtesy. No wonder that society was stirred to its depths, we say, when Christians were coolly told that He whom they had worshiped, upon whose divine power they had been taught to lean, to whom they looked up with a fervid and reverential love strong enough to carry them

with songs of triumph through devouring flames, was no more of a God in actuality than any one of the hundreds whom they had hurled down from their marble pedestals.

The emperor undertook to allay the ferment, and writing a hortatory letter he sent the famous Hosius of Cordova with it to Alexandria, in the hope that through these means he would easily reconcile the disputants by force of argument and weight of influence. Sadly discovering that he had miscalculated the resistance to be overcome, he next adopted a plan which could hardly have been executed by one whose sway was less extensive and his rule less unquestioned. Indeed it almost seems fortunate for the Church that Constantine at that juncture wielded the influence which he did over its affairs. Mutual agreement might have inclined the bishops to congregate, but without the facilities for travel afforded them by the imperial mandate which placed at their disposal the asses, mules, and horses employed on the roads for the transaction of public business, not to mention the generous subsistence accorded them by the same authority during the entire period of the session, they would hardly have surmounted in any numbers the difficulties they would have encountered in attempting to carry out their wishes. Even as it was the great majority of the members were residents of the East, though of the Western prelates a sufficient number appeared to constitute a respectable representation. Thus, in this case, a great evil was not unattended by visible good.

At Nice, a city of Bithynia, in the year 325, A. D., assembled three hundred and eighteen fathers of the Church, besides presbyters and deacons to the number of about two thousand. Asia as far east as Mesopotamia, and to Arabia on the south, Egypt and Lybia in Africa, and Europe along the Mediterranean as far as Italy were present by delegates. Scythia, Spain, and Persia, each had one representative, nor was there wanting a Goth. The four apostolic sees of Antioch, Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Rome sent their occupants, Eustathius, Macarius, and Alexander, or, in the case of Julius, who was incapacitated from attending by old age, two presbyters, Vito and Vicentius, in his stead. A few prominent figures must be sketched before we proceed to narrate the doings of the great synod.

Hosius, bishop of Cordova, has been already mentioned. Being the only man that sat in that council who can possibly be

considered as the rival of Athanasius in theological attainments, coming from the farthest west of Europe as the spokesman of the Spanish Church, and enjoying the high distinction of being the trusted counselor of the emperor, he may well claim the first place in our attention. During the seventy years of his episcopate it was his lot to assist at numerous councils,—at that of Illiberis in 305 A. D., of Arles in 314, of Sardica in 347, over which last he presided; and of Sirmium, which he attended with reluctance. At this Arian council the poor old man, whose faculties were weakened by the strain of a hundred years, was subjected to stripes and tortures until he consented to sign the formula to which the emperor Constantius, at the instigation of the heretics, required the sanction of his venerated name. This momentary weakness the patriarch repented before he went to receive the reward of his long labors, for it is said that he afterwards recanted. We may be sure that there entered the hall of the assembly no more honored personage than this sexagenarian, a steadfast confessor in the persecutions of Maximin, and the confidant of the throne in regard to the Latin Church.

If historians are right in seating Hosius on the left hand of the emperor, it can hardly be doubted that the still more honorable position was given to the elegant panegyrist who formally addressed, as he sat in the hall, that royal master whose ear he, above all other ecclesiastics of the East, had gained, Eusebius Pamphilus, bishop of Cæsarea, a man not deficient in rhetorical skill nor in literary talent, and particularly noted for his vast erudition and the prolificness of his pen, whom we should respect as the father of Church history. His fame has been obscured by charges of Arianism which may not be entirely undeserved: it was, however, his misfortune to bear the same name with the bishop of Nicomedia, who sat in the same council and was almost more of an Arian than the founder of the sect himself; besides being a man who understood and freely used the arts of *diplomacy*, which he did not properly distinguish from *trickery*. The two men are so thoroughly blended by distance and perspective that we cannot divest ourselves of the idea that a very close similarity between the characters of the two dignitaries did exist; in which judgment moderns may be pardoned when the ancients report that he of Cæsarea only escaped martyrdom by sacrificing to an idol. It ought nevertheless to be recorded as a counterpoise that,

out of regard for ancient custom, he declined the proffered patriarchal throne of Antioch, because an acceptance would have translated him from one see to another. In Eusebius of Cæsarea we certainly have a striking contrast to Hosius of Cordova, the one temporizing, vacillating, courtly; the other, frank, honest, stern, not over-polished, firm as a rock,—for we may permit ourselves to forget the momentary weakness of a mortal who has reached his tenth decade. May we not say that Constantine enjoyed the unusual privilege of actually *listening* to the two counselors who are always seated at the right and left of human judgment, one advocating expediency, the other unswerving rectitude? What a man these two favorites would have made compounded into one! Such a man was present in that chamber: we will speak of him after we have bestowed a passing glance upon one who rose into prominence about this time.

Eustathius of Antioch deserves mention not so much for any unusual capacities of mind, as for the unswerving purpose and sublime courage with which he supported the orthodox cause. He was condemned by a synod of the heretics, driven from his flock, which resented the robbery in angry tumults, recalled by Jovian, banished again by Valens, and doomed to die in exile. When the "Ariomanitæ," or "Raving Arians," as the vehemence of orthodox oratory sometimes styled them, were looking about for a victim, their glance naturally rested upon one marked out for their hatred by the prominence of his station, the clearness of his views, and the forcibleness with which he stated his opinions. Eustathius bore up manfully against the storm, and deserves the praise of all who admire fidelity and heroism.

As Alexandria had nourished the plant from which came the poison, it was eminently proper that it should also furnish the antidote. The inflicting of an Arius can be pardoned to a Church which gave the world the wisdom, the glorious example, and the priceless memory of an Athanasius. Many a time during the sittings of the First Council must Alexander have congratulated himself upon his discernment and foresight in bringing with him his youthful deacon. Though probably excluded by his humble station from taking part in the public debates, the voice of Athanasius, we may be sure, was heard in many a private gathering, preliminary or held for consultation after the formal opening of the Council. His brain supplied many an argument which was lis-

tened to from other lips, his wisdom dictated many a step which the inferior powers of those above him would never have originated, and his dauntless spirit actuated more than one timid shepherd when uttering words of higher tone than his own heart would have prompted. Extraordinary assertions are these to make concerning a young man of twenty-five years, but the homage of universal admiration ought to be accepted as proof that they are not exaggerated. Athanasius may have been hated, as doubtless he has been; but despised, never. The batteries of sarcasm have often been leveled against the champion of the Homoöusion, openly, as by the ultra-liberals of our day, covertly, as by the chronicler of the Decline, but always with visible trembling of limb. Of all uninspired men, not one perhaps has attained the just renown of this hero. His preëminence largely consisted in the universality of his capabilities. To rule men requires the very perfection of moral and mental powers, and if ever man was born to guide his fellow-beings in critical junctures, that man was Athanasius. It is true that if intellectual worth is to be measured by the number of books read and the facility of producing quotations, many have excelled the dauntless archbishop, and among those assembled worthies the palm would have to be conceded to Eusebius; but then we dispute the soundness of this test. It would be scarcely less unreasonable to calculate muscular strength by the amount of food eaten and the rapidity of bodily contortions. Let us apply better criteria. Very much as it is proper to estimate bodily power by the resistance overcome, it is allowable to compute mental force by success in the arena of debate. The argumentative power of Athanasius has never been excelled, perhaps not even rivaled: others may have exhibited more dexterity in wielding the foils of mock combat, but when the question is of downright, solid, practical, and profound reasoning, the superior of this divine has not yet been developed. The subject matter of his discussions was the deepest that can engage man's attention, the *Substance of Godhead*, and was handled by him with such surpassing skill that fifteen centuries of continued strife have hardly succeeded in fabricating a new weapon, and that the greatest champions of English orthodoxy against modern Arianism delighted to acknowledge him for their master. No single brain and no combination of brains could resist his arguments: neither Arius nor Eusebius of Nicomedia, nor the whole sect combined, could face

them except with quibbles and evasions. That the persuasiveness of his eloquence was equal to its convincingness is far from certain, and yet it appears extremely improbable that his fiery harangues failed to carry along with them the sympathies of even the coldest auditors. In nothing, however, was the mightiness of his genius more apparent than in his executive ability. Living in a succession of crises, we never read that he omitted to do the right thing at the right moment, or that he did it otherwise than most skillfully. When all else were irresolute, perplexed, in despair, when the leaders had exhausted every resource, were at a loss for an expedient, and doubtful whether to yield or die, Athanasius's fertile invention was ready with a plan, his understanding clear and strong in showing its feasibility, his tact quick to seize the most efficient way of bringing the skeptical and doubtful into his mode of thinking, and his spirit fearless, commanding, and resolute in advancing through opposition and danger to the best attainable result. All classes of men bowed to his genius: it made no difference whether he was dealing with the cultivated and dignified officers of church and state or with the rude mob of a seaside emporium, with the disciplined soldiery of the empire or with the terrible fanatics of the Nitrian monastic communities, always a king among his fellows, he ruled them with the absolute despotism of manifest mental superiority when united with singleness of aim and purity of heart. His moral qualities were, if possible, even more conspicuous. The holiness of his life was such that even his bitterest enemies (and no one ever had more bitter ones) could hardly conjure up a calumny against him. They did charge him with the heaviest crimes, murder and adultery, but were each time put to silence in overwhelming disgrace. Was he violent in his denunciations of the Arians? We may palliate that offense by pleading the warmth of controversy, if we do not even challenge the accuser to show that the language was not justified by the occasion. Shall we require a man to defend the central doctrine of the faith with the calmness which might not be out of place in a mathematical discussion? Shall we fault him for betraying some emotion, some passion even, when contemplating the plots and inroads of a set of recusants and outlaws who have gone on from "denying the Lord that bought them" to the persecution of His followers? If courage and fidelity are virtues, when were these ever displayed to greater advantage than by this

intrepid bishop, who suffered almost everything in behalf of his Creed? In fine, then, we behold at the side of Alexander a youth, like St. Paul of insignificant personal appearance, small and spare, but destined to be the foremost man of his age in the eyes of his contemporaries, and a marvel to all succeeding times, endowed with a rare combination of the most brilliant and solid faculties, a scholar, logician, divine, orator, statesman, advocate, and ruler, all in one; quick, versatile, comprehensive, systematic, and profound; fearless, disinterested, cautious, decided, prompt, tenacious, humble, self-reliant, and self-contained; pure-minded, zealous, devout, gentle, sympathetic, personally magnetic, discerning, honorable, and pious; beloved, admired, almost feared by all except those who belonged to the opposing party, and by them dreaded scarcely less than though he had been the Prince of Evil himself. Such was the great Athanasius, so named, as it would appear from the event, by the spirit of prophecy, for, in very truth, of all that have been born to die none has attained more entirely than he such exemption from this lot as is afforded by the *Immortality* of fame.

His life, crowded with incidents and dignified by the steadfast pursuit, through the entire duration of his episcopate, of one grand aim, was not less remarkable than his character. It would be no easy task to select from history any one person who has passed through a greater round of vicissitudes, and been a prominent actor in so many varied scenes of thrilling interest; and indeed it may admit of question whether the most vivid imagination of poet, novelist, or romancer has ever invented a biography more brilliant with dramatic coloring. He first appears as the sportive bishop of a childish game, in which his companions contented themselves with personating presbyters and deacons, and displayed the strange intuitive power of childhood by ceding his proper place to the future prelate: on this occasion the fortunate occurrence of Alexander's passing the group is said to have secured them all a theological education. Then we behold him when barely twenty-five years old Archdeacon, the right-hand man of Alexandria's Pope, and we might almost say director of the first great synod. Within five months from the date of his return we find him grasping the pastoral staff which death has wrested from the hand of his aged predecessor. He is now the bulwark of Christendom, occupying the highest throne and plant-

ing it in the deadliest breach. Charges of a heinous nature are brought against him by his enemies, and he is summoned to answer them before a synod of his adversaries convoked at Cæsarea. He disdains such a tribunal, but obeys the command of his imperial master so far as to appear at a similar council held at Tyre, A. D. 335, attended by fifty of his suffragans. Eusebius of Cæsarea presided and conducted the proceedings in a manner not much to his credit. The accusations covered much ground, and had the odor of foul exhalations. Athanasius was equal to the occasion, baffling the accusers with marvelous skill. What could have been more shrewdly devised than the artifice by which, when a lewd woman was introduced to testify that he had sinned with her, Timotheus, the presbyter, steps before the creature, who did not even know her intended victim by sight, and, as though he had been Athanasius himself, interrogates her, draws the fire of her over-charged effrontery, and makes her declare that *he* was the man who had committed the deed of violence? More tragic is the scene in which the *murdered* Arsenius is uncloaked. In witness of the killing of that Meletian bishop, an embalmed hand, after having been exhibited in many places to a shocked and incredulous public, was produced in court. "How many hands has nature furnished a man with?" we can almost hear that incisive voice demand, as the cloak is raised on both sides of a well-known figure, and the two hands of the living Arsenius are exhibited to the abashed sight of those malevolent heretics. But the condemnation of the great man was a foregone conclusion. Not tamely yielding to the base enmity of his antagonists, Athanasius suddenly transfers himself to the principal street of the New Rome, and, overawing the guards with his majestic bearing, asks justice at the hands of an angry monarch, who must have been astonished at his boldness in approaching him. Athanasius was banished to the court of Treves, but his seat at Alexandria was allowed to remain unfilled. Twenty years, out of the forty-six during which he held the crosier, were spent in enforced absence. Much of this time he lay concealed in order to save his life. Such a man could count upon the fidelity of his friends. If any one intended to betray him, which very seldom happened, he was always beforehand with the traitor or traitress, and made his escape. His asylum was everywhere. He could flee to the caves in the desert, sure that the hermits would joyfully

embrace the death of martyrdom, almost to the last man, rather than reveal his hiding-place; or he could penetrate, according to the story told with such evident relish by a not over-scrupulous historian, into the sanctum of spotless virginity and there be welcomed, concealed, and served with the devoted attachment and unsuspecting trust which no ordinary man could elicit. His power of concealment and rapid movement was so surprising as to be ascribed by the vulgar to a knowledge of witchcraft and magic. It is even possible that he actually *saw* councils, such as those of Rimini and Selencia, at which his presence was not even suspected at the time. One might say, without great exaggeration, that he possessed the faculty of rendering himself invisible. Upon the accession of Julian, he is obliged to flee in a boat up the Nile. Ascertaining that enemies are on his track, he turns behind the bend of the river, retraces his course, answers the hail, "Where is Athanasius?" with the brief reply, "He is near," passes on, and escapes. Self-possession and shrewdness, beautifully as they manifested themselves in the crisis just mentioned, shone forth more brilliantly in his response to the demand of Constantius for the opening of one Alexandrian church to the Arians; "I will grant a church to the heretics at Alexandria, as soon as you grant a church to the Orthodox at Antioch." Neither Horatius nor Regulus, not Epaminondas, Miltiades, nor Leonidas appears to greater advantage for calmness and heroism in danger than Athanasius on the ever-memorable night which saw the Church of St. Theonas broken into by the soldiers of Syrianus while a vigil was being kept preparatory to the celebration of the Eucharist. Though urged to save himself, the bishop scorned to forsake his people. Ordering the 136th Psalm to be sung, with its inspiring chorus, "For His mercy endureth forever," he stood collectedly at the altar till the shouts of the assailants, mingled with the cries and shrieks of the helpless multitude, had drowned the sound of praise, and till the building was nearly emptied of the surviving worshipers, and then at last consented to consult his own safety.

Wonderfully did Divine Providence provide for the preservation of the Catholic Church during this most terrible struggle and fearful danger by raising up such a man, and protecting and supporting him through those long years of contention. Indefatigable as well as zealous, Athanasius allowed himself no respite, but in exile, not less than when ruling over his see, his time, energies, prayers, and

fervent love were given to the imperiled ark. If he was debarred from using other instrumentalities, he could at least wield the pen. If any new argument was launched upon the sea of controversy, it was exhaustively treated almost immediately, and definitely and finally pronounced upon, by an author who might be recognized, at least, if not formally identified. Nor need imperial tyranny expect to escape unscathed. From out of concealment and exile issued a hand which seized the throne of Constantius, and shook it till that weak prince raged in impotent wrath as he tried in vain to crush the nimble foe who exposed his follies and crimes to a suffering and persecuted Church. Like Elijah of old, Athanasius seemed to stand *alone*, a solitary witness for the truth of God, and yet unfaltering in his faith and unwavering in his trust, sure that the right was on his side and must eventually prevail; the grandest spectacle earth affords. Says Hooker: "Only of Athanasius there was nothing observed throughout the course of that long tragedy, other than such as very well became a wise man to do, and a righteous to suffer."

Truly, this was a remarkable synod: such an one it was in many respects as none have been, or perhaps could have been, since. It was not twenty years since the Apocalyptic vision of the Second Seal had come to its end in the final sheathing of his weapon by the Rider on the Red Horse, to whom was given the great sword wherewith to slay the servants of Christ; not more than seventy-five since the terrible edicts of Decius had rolled the crested wave of blood from end to end of the vast empire. Scarcely a member of that Council but bare upon his body the stamp of persecution. Here stood a bowed figure all wrenched and distorted by the sufferings he had borne, there another whose face wore the scar of an empty and seared socket where the right eye had been till the cruel sword dug it out, here a stately form marred by the loss of the right arm, and yet another which stood insecurely upon a ham-strung leg. Paphnutius, Potammon, Paul of Cæsarea formed a group displaying all these varieties of mutilation. When no such plainly apparent traces had been left, the removal of the tunic would often have disclosed a furrowed back. If we may rely upon tradition, only fifteen out of the three hundred and eighteen had altogether escaped maltreatment. From such a gathering of confessors, the first that had assembled, the last that was likely to be held now that the world had ceased

to rage against the fold, what forbearance, and humility, and calmness, and charitableness, as well as unblenching firmness, might not justly be expected! Surely venerable men who had fearlessly laid down their lives for the exceeding love they bore the Saviour of the world could be counted upon to discuss the great questions which were being forced upon their notice in a temper befitting brethren and Christians! Nor were these expectations disappointed.

After holding various informal meetings, the council at last assembled in solemn state within the walls of the palace, and awaited the presence of the Emperor, who in due time appeared and advanced towards the upper end of the hall, not, however, ascending his seat till invited to do so by the bishops. The right of this dignitary to the position in which the narrative places him is far from indisputable, nor can any arguments drawn from the grace and mildness and efficiency with which he played the part of Moderator, possess sufficient cogency to overthrow the conviction that the precedent thus established was a bad one. Who and what was Constantine that he should direct the deliberations of this assembly? In the eyes of the Church the proudest potentate is no more than a mere layman. Just as properly might an eunuch of the bed-chamber have occupied that throne as Constantine the Great. The diffidence of the haughty conqueror, and the blush which mantled his cheek when he advanced before so many honored fathers of the Church, shall not hide from us the fact that he had stepped out of his proper province when he presumed to convoke them, and that he transgressed still more flagrantly the bounds of lay action when he assumed the seat which they did not refuse to accord him. However, it seems to be agreed that the immediate result of his interference was beneficial rather than injurious. Either by reason of the restraint imposed by the presence of the mighty prince, or because of the sobering and sanctifying influence of the severe education through which so many of the delegates had passed, a remarkable degree of harmony seems to have prevailed from the first to the last. Confessor after confessor arose to give his testimony as to the belief of his particular church, and when all who desired to be heard had occupied the floor, a Creed was adopted with very little dissent, and a letter drawn up and sent with one accord to those among whom Arianism had seen the light. This done and a few other matters

duly settled, the chief shepherds, glad in heart at the happy conclusion reached, and refreshed by fraternal communion, hastened their return to the flocks they had left, little thinking, it may be, how many generations would look back with deep veneration to the Bithynian gathering by the shores of the Ascanian Lake.

It is necessary now to study attentively the theological results of the Council. In thinking of the Deity, man necessarily transfers to Him ideas formed from reflecting upon his own nature: no other course is open to us. In regard to the individual man, he may be considered in his points of resemblance to his fellows or in his absolute distinctness from each and every other being: he shares with all who belong to the human family a nature possessing certain characteristics, while he stands alone by himself an individual man. He has a *nature* and a *personality*. Viewing still more closely his *nature*, and comparing it, as it manifests itself, as it exists, in him, with the natures (so to speak) of other persons, we are drawn on to the question, Is the nature of A. the *same* as that of B., or only *similar* to it? If we conclude that the relation is that of *sameness*, inasmuch as that of mere *similarity* more properly belongs to a comparison such as of man's nature with the ape's, we must qualify this conclusion by explicitly defining the *sameness* of which we treat as not that of identity, but of quality and characteristic: in other words, two men have the same *nature*, but not the same *substance*. We rise to God, and reverently seek to make an application of these distinctions to the Godhead. In the Godhead exist three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: what is the relation of each to the others? If we say that the relationship is the same as that of man to man, we become Tritheists at once, and have three separate gods, each of which is infinite and eternal. The nature of *Divinity* is not capable of being thus divided: that which is God is God whole and entire; or else it is none at all. Personal distinctions may and do exist; the Father *begets*, the Son is *begotten*, the Holy Spirit *proceeds;* the Father creates, the Son redeems, the Holy Ghost sanctifies; but there remains *somewhat* which is the same in all three, something which corresponds to *substance* or *nature* in man, and yet differs from that in not being given in separate portions to each; for the Father is *whole* God (so to express the conception), the Son is whole God, and the Spirit is whole God. There are not three gods, as there must be if to each appertains a distinct portion of

the Divine essence, but one God only. A word is needed for this *somewhat*, and must labor under the disadvantage that it will savor of materialism. *Essence*, *being*, *substance*, all these convey carnal ideas more or less, and are so far objectionable. What other course is open than to select the word which seems most appropriate, as being most expressive of the important idea and at the same time least open to objection, and make it a *technical* word, *i. e.*, arbitrarily (if the reader choose) and authoritatively pronounce that this given word shall in theology carry with it the meaning we put upon it? Theology can scarcely be denied, with any propriety, a liberty which is freely granted to other sciences. The word thus selected was by no means a new one, but can be found in more than one ante-Nicene writer of orthodox fame applied just as the Council appropriated it, a fact which hardly needs further establishment than the confession of Eusebius of Cæsarea. Tertullian, Origen, Dionysius of Alexandria, and the martyr Pamphilus are shown by Bishop Bull to have thus employed the "unius substantiæ" of the Latins, or "Homoöusion" of the Greeks. It may be deemed unfortunate that an Antiochene Council, held some sixty years previously, had condemned the use of this word; but it is undoubtedly true that the disapprobation of the seventy fathers was pointed, not at the word, but at the abuse of it by Paul of Samosata. In the same way had Tritheists first employed the term *Trinity*, it might have come to pass that a synod would have rejected that expression. "Homoöusion" was a good word and an orthodox word, notwithstanding that for particular reasons it had once been thrown aside, and the Council of Nicæa had ample justification for its course in adopting it. Notwithstanding, much of the opposition which the new formula encountered was in reality an exhibition of dissatisfaction with the word chosen, and not a denial of the truth which was intended to be enshrined in the phrase "Of one substance with the Father." Does this prove that the selection was ill-judged? Not till some demonstration has been offered of the superior merits and greater acceptability of some other word: till such time as this has been shown, we may allowably indulge ourselves in the belief that no other phraseology would have at once fulfilled all the requirements of the case, and met with less opposition from those who were correct in their theology. If in litigation it is desirable to reach a statement upon which the two parties can join issue with

a view to trying the case upon its merits, the word *Homoöusion* surely was well chosen; for, he who denied that Father and Son were *of one substance* manifestly held that the latter was inferior in respect of essential being, and therefore, however he might refine and ratiocinate, not really divine. Arius and Eusebius would doubtless have preferred the insertion of some other word; but would that preference have been attributable to a desire for a union based upon truth, or to a wish that they might be permitted to remain in communion without renouncing a deadly error which they were resolved to retain? Their actions from first to last exclude the former supposition.

The unlearned are apt to be a little startled upon first hearing that the barrier between the orthodox and unorthodox was nothing more than a matter of a single vowel. With what cannot be characterized as a strong regard for fairness, some persons of sophistical turn are fond of reïterating that the protracted debate, the lasting and bitter conflict, the sad disturbance of Christian peace were caused by an insignificant *iota*. The Orthodox, we are to understand, very stubbornly and uncharitably misused their advantage of numbers to gratify their dislike for the *iota* in the word *Homoiousion*, which means *of like substance*. What fanatical philologists must those grave fathers have been! The most learned and ablest men of the age, men who had, almost to a man, braved torture and death for their faith, who were many of them nearly at the goal of their earthly course, giving loose rein to hoary-headed folly, rent the Christian world into fragments because of one letter of a single word! Strange infatuation! Who does not instinctively revert to those solemn words of Him who spake as never man spake: "One jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled," remembering that *jot* is the Hebrew letter (yod) corresponding to the Greek *iota*. Nay! This tremendous struggle was not about words at all: it was a contest which laid hold upon the very Mercy-seat within the veil. The venerable council did not shield the Homoöusion with the lightning of a righteous indignation, because they disliked an *iota*, but because that trifling scratch of a pen made the same havoc as an equally inconsiderable effort of a scribe might at the end of *God*. If the addition of an *s* can change worship into idolatry, let us not ridicule those holy bishops if they were very strenuous opponents of an *i*.

We have said that the Father is not one god and the Son another, but that each is whole and entire God: does it not follow, as a logical conclusion, that the two are in effect but one, *Father* and *Son* being merely different names given under varying circumstances? We reply, that no such consequence ensues at all: it would inevitably ensue were *finite* natures being discussed, but here the question is concerning a nature which is not conditioned in time and space, not divisible and limitable, not subjected to any of the embarrassments of matter. When we assert that the Father and the Son are both the same God, we do not fall into Sabellianism, as Eusebius upon the same ground falsely charged Eustathius of Antioch with doing, for we as firmly maintain the distinction of personality as we do identity of essence; and while we teach that the separate persons are the same God, we hold that they *are* persons, and not mere *manifestations;* that they possess different characteristics and exercise diverse functions; that they are so far distinct from one another that they can converse together, interchange emotion, and *commune* in the highest sense of that word. Does an objector reply that all this is absurd, that a being cannot at once be the same as another and yet different? It is fitting to rejoin that it is not absurd at all, that many things on earth are identical in one sense, and yet different in another, and that we do not say that the Father and the Son are identical *in the same sense* in which they are distinguished. Let the doubting man of science cast his ray of white sunlight upon the prism, and, proceeding to his spectral analysis, classify the resultant rays into those of light, of heat, and of chemical action, and then inform us whence came those three distinct classes if not from that unresolved beam of pure whiteness; and further instruct us whether he can produce the photographic effect with the red ray, or gather heat from those which are actinic. Light, heat, and electricity are not at all the same thing, their properties being extremely diverse, and yet all three are supposed to be little more than varying phenomena of the same substance, slightly diversified wave motion of one imponderable ether. Man's mind is said to possess many different faculties, though nothing, perhaps, is more universally agreed upon than that these are only *phases* of one indivisible soul; Perception, Reason, Judgment, Love, Hatred, Volition not being distinct from each other as hand, and foot, and eye, but rather the self-adaptive action of a single organ modifying

itself according to circumstances, just as smoothness and warmth are felt by the same sense of touch variously applied. These analogies, partly favoring the orthodox view, partly countenancing the unorthodox explanations, are not to be mistaken for arguments: their use is to assist us in attempting to frame conceptions of the matter under investigation. The Bible, which we maintain to be God's own utterance, reveals to us the two contradictory (*apparently* contradictory) statements; on the one side, that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are all possessed of one indivisible and unextended essence; on the other, that there exist in the Godhead three personal Beings, distinct as all individuals must be, not aspects nor manifestations, but persons; somewhat perhaps as though Intellect, Emotion, and Volition, in man, were separated and erected into individual existence; each possessing his own characteristics, and not at all to be confounded with the others. If the logician adopts the former proposition and treats it according to his rules, he arrives speedily and irresistibly at Sabellianism, or the belief that the so-called personalities are mere modes; whereas if, preferring the latter, he proceeds in a similar manner, he will soon make port either in Tritheism with its three gods, or else in Arianism or its kindred errors, with its solitary unipersonal, lonely Deity and created Christ. There seems no stopping-place, no harbor of refuge, in either case, short of the destinations mentioned. What then? Must a man, with childlike confidence, put his hand in that of the pedagogue, Logic, and follow implicitly his guidance? If he does, he will not escape perplexity among the Antinomies; he will be led into a labyrinth, and then deserted by his guide. Logic is equally capable of proving that matter is infinitely divisible, and that it is *not* so; since, on the one hand, you cannot conceive an atom so small that it cannot be cut into halves, nor, on the other, can you admit the possibility of prolonging this process endlessly, without ascribing infinitude to matter: here Logic gives up in despair and flees from his votaries, leaving them on the verge of madness. Logic knows little awe; it can demonstrate the impossibility of an existence which had no beginning: therefore it is *atheistic*. Logic, when studying human nature, advances with steady step and courageous heart, on one road to Calvinism, and with not less assured pace, on another highway to Pelagianism; which conclusions are mutually destructive. It behooves us, then, to seek a level far below that of Logic, one

whereupon our footing may be truly stable. One of the greatest needs of the thinking world, a want which is brought clearly before us in the present instance as a necessity of the theological world, is a *sound philosophy*. In nothing shines forth more beautifully the transcendent glory of God's Church than that she, through divine guidance, took her stand upon the only tenable principles of philosophy ages before the Kantian and Scotch schools had begun to work their way towards them. The proper method of philosophizing is not to begin at one extreme and advance indefinitely from that with the measured tread of ratiocination, but to start simultaneous from both extremes, and strive diligently for as thorough a parallelism or coincidence of the two lines of thought as may be attainable. Logicians are prone to reject as *absurd* what is not absurd at all, except to those who look on the surface. Of two apparently contradictory theses, both have been unanswerably proved time and again, and not infrequently a satisfactory reconcilement has been attained after patient waiting. What is really, and finally, and evidently *opposed* to reason must be rejected, but not what is obscure only because too high or too deep to be reached by finite powers. If caution attends the steps of a wise man when exploring terrestrial regions, how much more does he need such a monitor when roving afar off into the difficult passes of divinity! Is our knowledge of the Eternal Nature so great that we can venture to pronounce upon its capabilities? Are our conceptions regarding it so clear that we dare affirm that the trine personality in one indivisible substance is irreconcilably hostile to them? Affirmative replies to these interrogatories can safely be made by no one who has not pondered them long, patiently, and prayerfully. A supercilious dismissal of these questions is rash in the extreme. Our business in the great question of the Consubstantiality, is to accept the various dogmatic statements of the Bible and the Church, acknowledge that, in the very nature of things, we must be incapable of comprehending them, systematize them as well as we can, and when we have ascended as high as our wings will support us, humbly terminate our investigations with the self-reminder that *the unreconciled* is not by any means equivalent to *the unreconcilable*.

One additional point of doctrine needs to be adjusted. We are taught that three persons are perfectly and absolutely divine,

each of them possessing the eternal substance of deity. Are these persons in all respects equal? we naturally ask ourselves. Reason assures us that all, being infinite in power and wisdom, and equally eternal, must be far removed from all distinctions of superior and inferior; and Revelation corroborates this testimony by ascribing equal glory to the three divine Persons. Yet a most important difference is noticeable, in that one only of the three has the divine essence *of Himself*, the others deriving that same essence from Him through Generation or Procession. The Father alone being unoriginated, derives from that fact a certain superiority of prerogative, a priority, not of existence, but of order. All the three Persons are equal in nature, but to the Father belongs such priority that He can properly exercise authority towards the Second Person of the Trinity of such a kind that it would be inconceivable as exerted by the Son towards His Father, as, for example, of sending upon a mission. This, which has variously been named the doctrine "De Subordinatione Filii" or that "De Monarchia" (Τῆς Μοναρχίας), is a vital one, inasmuch as without it we cannot support the *Unity* of God, for, as soon as two underived essences are allowed, we have two independent gods. Having been the teaching of the Church from the beginning, as Bishops Pearson and Bull evince by a copious citation of authorities, it was incorporated in the "God *of* God, Light *of* Light, Very God *of*" (from) "Very God" of the Nicene Creed, and in the "Who proceedeth from the Father" of the enlarged formula which was set forth by the First Council of Constantinople; and formulated, defined, and defended by the redoubtable Athanasius. This tenet, again, cannot be received into the convictions without a resolute bending of the stubborn and fractious will, a humble confession of the inability of the finite intellect to grapple with the mystery, and a reverential regard for the uttered voice of God; but some help may be derived by such as have not closed their minds against conviction, from the very simple reflection that a son is not necessarily *inferior* to his father; for, though the second Pitt possibly was so and Sir John Herschel, Alexander the Great was not, nor evidently are the great majority of distinguished men: they owe their parents the respect due from children, and yet may be their equals in every other way.

If the doctrine of the Trinity is repugnant to the human in-

tellect, we cannot but wonder that the mind of man, ignorant of the mystery and unable to discover it, is always reaching out after it. The leading mythologies of the world, at all events, have vibrated between unity and tritheism, finding a permanent resting-place for the soles of their feet nowhere; swinging now towards the grand central conception of One God, then seemingly becoming gradually more sensible of repulsion from the unutterable loneliness of a Being who can have no satisfying communion with any other because all are so very far below Him, until a recoil manifests itself in associating other gods with Him in a great Olympus or Walhalla: now, however, antagonisms arise and impel irresistibly the natural lover of unity and harmony back to some awful, overruling Shape, almost too remote and vague for personality. This process continues. Jupiter is the supreme god, and then he is not. Neptune and Pluto share his dominion, only that all three may succumb to an inscrutable Destiny, which has scarcely assumed its icy seat, before the three Fates usurp its place, but only that the iron-handed monarch should immediately reappear in more impenetrable darkness. Brahma, too, never knows how long before Vishnu and Siva will divide with him the allegiance of the unstable Hindoo, who, like the Greek and Roman, can strike out of his religious faith neither the unity of God nor His threefoldness, and forever strives in vain to reconcile what to him must remain antagonistic cravings. Nor does the Scandinavian heaven contain any god who can boast an undisputed sway. Zoroastrianism was unitarian before it became dualistic. In short, the awful solitude of an unipersonal God is to the last degree repulsive and intolerable: men reject it instinctively, unconsciously, invincibly. Even Dualism is more attractive, if it be less logical; but Dualism, even were the two gods on terms of friendship, would not satisfy the requirements of the problem. The worshiper would feel himself excluded. Two equal beings removed from the universe by the whole distance between the Creator and what His fiat has evoked, would not be lonely, we must admit; but the natural exclusiveness of such a relationship is perceived to warn off intruders. Who dare disturb them with representations of his needs? Who could hope to divert towards himself one little ray of the mutually-absorbed love? Evidently a third must be equal partner with the two, in order that within the enlarged circle of sympathy any

inferior being may entertain the expectation of obtaining a welcome admission. Under the shadow of such a throne, we may seek refuge, provided the divine Three are thoroughly in accord. Father and Son having as their copartner the Eternal Spirit, we feel that the love which passes back and forth among the Three can easily extend itself to the creature; but then we would be tritheists, and soon fall to dreading the contentions of the awful Beings whom we worshiped, had it not been revealed to us that the Three are, as they must be seeing that Deity cannot be apportioned, three Persons constituting one Godhead. What, therefore, the instinctive cravings of our God-created hearts have always striven after,—what they have sought, but could not find, —that has Revelation given us. Thus is the doctrine of the Trinity shown to be true, unless man himself is one enormous lie. Perish the blasphemous thought!

Thus the Nicene Council thoroughly committed itself to three immensely important doctrines, which are worthy of enumeration: 1st. That of the Eternal Generation of the Son, "Begotten of his Father before all worlds;" 2d. That of the Consubstantiality of the Word, "Of one substance with the Father;" and, 3d. That of the Monarchy of the Father, or of the Subordination of the Son, "God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God." These were contained in the creed adopted by the assembly and then subscribed by each member of it, with the exception of two who proved invincibly recalcitrant. Other matters were deliberated upon, the Quartodeciman controversy being decided in favor of those whose custom it was to celebrate the Festival of Easter upon the nearest Sunday to the Passover, instead of upon the third day therefrom, whatever day of the week that might happen to be; a proposed law of enforced clerical celibacy being averted from the Church by the courage and forecast of one man, the mutilated Paphnutius, himself unmarried; the Meletian schism being also disposed of by suitable legislation; and a few other affairs settled. All these, however, were not of sufficient moment to delay us longer in our haste to trace out the further history of Arianism.

Immediately we begin to lose ourselves in a maze of political intrigue, whence we extricate our feet at last, thoroughly satisfied that what advantages from its union with the State were reaped by the Church at the time of the great Council, deserve to be for-

gotten amid the accumulation of disasters speedily inflicted upon her by the conversion of the throne to Arianism. As we shall see, the sovereigns showed little reserve in advocating their own views through the instrumentalities which promised to be most efficient. Solemn assemblies were called by them, and then kept in durance and under terrorism until consent to the imperial projects had been wrung from them; bishops were driven from their sees, banished, condemned to death, tortured; the faithful, in indiscriminate mass, were visited with princely anger and smitten with a heavy hand, besides being coaxed and tricked into appearing to approve what their hearts detested; till it came to pass, after the Council of Rimini, that the whole world, according to St. Jerome, groaning, stood astonished at finding itself Arian. The rays of orthodoxy shone dimly through the smoke and dust of the conflict, so that its bewildered troops could hardly distinguish their own colors. The sheep had admitted the wolf when he was lavish of his promises, and now felt themselves very much at his mercy. Nero or Diocletian might terrify and slaughter Christians, but would never undertake to transform them into Gnostics; Constantine and his sons threatened the very life of Christianity by striking at the Truth from within the walls which had been built to protect it. The peril of the Church at this crisis was, if our principles be admitted, most imminent. Look at the epoch of the twin councils at Selencia and Rimini, when East and West had both, in regular conclave, cast out the Homoöusion and virtually declared in favor of heresy, and when the different provincial churches retained so little freedom that they had no facilities for proclaiming their dissent from the action of those two halves of a General Council. From the unwelcome sight one turns with palpitating heart, and with profound gratitude to the Almighty King whose merciful interposition rescued His kingdom from the fearful danger to which its own folly and faithlessness had exposed it.

Constantine, congratulating himself upon the admirable results of his policy in summoning the Nicene Synod, was doubtless greatly irritated at first by the opposition to its decrees shown by the Eusebian faction. Beginning with a vigorous attempt to put down Arianism by the strong hand, he ended with diverting his wrath from the followers of the heresiarch to Athanasius and his adherents, and setting on foot severe measures tending towards the suppression of Orthodoxy. The means by which he was

brought over, whether through the influence of his sister Constantia, who, upon her death-bed, recommended to his favor an Arian presbyter, or through the machinations of his favorite Eusebius, concerns us much less than the consequences produced thereby, among the most noteworthy of which were the banishment from the three chief bishopries of their occupants, Athanasius, Eustathius, and Paul, to make way for heterodox incumbents, and the recall of Arius and the other Eusebius. Arius did not long survive his triumph, which indeed was never consummated, accident, or the course of nature, or perhaps Divine providence, removing him from the world he had so long troubled at the very moment when his proud heart throbbed at beholding victory within his reach. The royal mandate had bidden Alexander, patriarch of Constantinople, to admit the arch-heretic to communion. Athanasius, like Ambrose, would have positively refused to obey such an impious command; but Alexander saw no road but that of submission. While the aged prelate prayed within his church on the eve of the day which was to witness its desecration unless some unlooked-for deliverance should come, Arius was parading the streets with his friends. The heretic is checked in his march by a sudden call of nature, and never returns to his place in the line. Was he poisoned, or was he smitten by the rod of Almighty indignation? True believers will always experience difficulty in shaking off the impression made upon their minds by the suddenness, wretchedness, and opportuneness of his death, combined with the strange fact that three at least of the Truth's greatest foes have perished by horrible disease of one particular part of the body. Says Sozomen, in quaint language: "With all men life terminates in death. We must not blame a man, even if he be an enemy, merely because he died, for it is uncertain whether we shall live till the evening." Neither, then, may we blame a man for writing his own creed on paper, and putting it under his arm when he goes to take oath that he believes a particular formula; but most persons will insist that the action is at least suspicious, especially in case his declaration should be couched in such phraseology as: "I do solemnly swear that I *hold* the sentiments which are *written*." However we may decide this point, the Church was well rid of the deceased, and may without impropriety have congratulated herself that she had been saved from a great disgrace, and thanked her Lord for so ordering events as to remove him from the stage at

that precise moment. Whether the story which Socrates reports, upon hearsay, concerning the Jesuitical subscription be true, whether the extraordinary death of the man be scarcely less significant than what the Scriptures relate about Ananias and his wife, or not, a great disturber of the Church's peace was silenced forever.

Constantine soon after, obedient to the summons which approaches monarchs as well as slaves, resigned his sceptre to his three sons, of whom the one who eventually encircled his own brows with an undivided diadem, Constantius, was a staunch Arian. The twenty-three years of his reign were a dark day for the Nicene Christians. Frequent synods in the East employed themselves in drawing up new formulæ, in which, while they did not openly impugn the *Homoöusion*, they took care to state the faith in terms less hostile to the errors of the Arians; in condemning and ejecting the champions of Nicæa as holding Sabellian notions which they actually abominated; and in creating new prelates from the most violent assailants of the Orthodox Creed. The West, stauncher by far than the Orient, stood manfully, with true Roman courage and fidelity, around the standard which Athanasius had prevailed upon the Great Council to plant. From Sardica a trumpet shout rang through the empire reäffirming the Homoöusion and the Eternal Generation. At Rimini, on the coast of the Adriatic, four hundred bishops of the West assembled, while those of the East gathered at Selencia in Isauria, the emperor having concluded that convenience and economy would both be promoted by convening the two continents in separate bodies. The conclave at Rimini spoke with startling distinctness, pronouncing with abhorrence against all schemes of altering the Nicene formula, and rejecting as an abomination the proposition of Ursacius, Valens, and the Arian minority to drop the distasteful word for the sake of peace. It is saddening to think how the frailty of sinful humanity was wrought upon, through that device of tyranny, a protracted session with compulsory attendance, involving exile from home, enforced inactivity, and exposure to intimidation, urgent persuasion, and other undue influences, till the majority yielded the point, and departed to their homes under the reproach of having lent countenance to falsehood.

The philosophical indifference of Julian withdrew from a restless faction the support accorded by the government in his prede-

cessor's reign. Jovian imitated the tolerance of the Apostate. Then came Valentinian and Valens, dividing the vast territory between them. It happened, unfortunately, that the Goths, affrighted and dismayed by the advance of the uncouth barbaric tribes of Huns, opened a negotiation with the emperor Valens; for he, being a pronounced Arian, dispatched missionaries of that persuasion, and among them the celebrated Ulphilas, to introduce Christianity among these new feudatories of the empire. Thus it came to pass that the barbarians, who soon spread themselves over the extended domains of Rome in Europe and Northern Africa, adhered to that perverted form of religion which claimed Arius as its progenitor. Had it not been for this untoward circumstance Arianism would have been hard pushed for an asylum after Theodosius, a zealous Athanasian, upon ascending the throne, had deprived that sect of its churches, and enacted severe laws, withdrawing their civil rights from those who clung to the heresy, and affixing to them the stigma of social excommunication.

The centrifugal force which had torn Arius and his followers from the orbits in which they should have revolved around the centre of ecclesiastical unity, would not suffer them to describe ellipses about the newly chosen foci without serious perturbation. Like other forces of disruption, heresy does not always submit to be checked just at that mark which would best conform to the intentions of those who set it in motion. He who teaches men to mutiny in order that he may lead them whither he will, has taught them a lesson which they and he will remember in the hour of their dissatisfaction with his leadership. He who sets the example of obstinate adherence to a favorite theory against authority which all are bound to respect, and in spite of proof which ought to convince any intelligent mind, has, without anticipating such an unpleasant consequence, established a precedent which will justify his own bolder spirited followers in pushing that theory to extremes he himself shuns and abhors. Such an unbridled soul was the skeptical Aëtius, whose impious tenets won for him the surname of *Atheist*. He carried his speculations concerning the Son's Generation to the length of maintaining that it was a mere creation, and took place in time; and with respect to His Substance argued, as consistency required him to do, that it was in no respect like that of the Father, being separated from His by the

whole distance which divides the creature from the Creator. How Arius himself stopped short of these blasphemous doctrines, having once intrusted himself to the impetuous stream of Logical Deduction, we need not trouble ourselves to inquire; but we certainly ought to accord Aëtius the praise of having been an able and acute reasoner, and subtile and powerful advocate, and a frank and fearless speaker. He and his more politic disciple, Eunomius, did not lack followers. A far larger proportion, however, of those who found themselves outside of the camp, preferred to range themselves on the other flank, where waved the banner of Eusebius. These rejected Generation, and yet hardly believed in Creation; refused to accept the Eternity, and still confessed that the Son came into being long anterior to the universe, or even the angels; would not listen to the Homoöusion, and yet allowed that the substance of the Son was unlike that of other creatures and *similar* to the Father's. Arius himself had taken high ground, giving to our Saviour even the Incommunicable Name itself in a restricted sense, and placing Him above the highest archangel: the Semi-Arians strive to take a flight even above this position, and labor to bring the adorable Son nearer yet in honor, power, and essential being to His Father. Why, then, it may be asked, were these last, if none others, not welcomed back into the Church by throwing open the gates wide enough to admit their standard? Because, painfully as they strained their limbs, they failed to touch that after which they reached; because they who reduce our Lord to the level of a created being, however much they may refine upon the idea of creation, as really dethrone Him as those do who boldly assert that He was created since time began; and because all who detract in any degree from the honor due to Him who was begotten, in time, of the Virgin Mary, utterly destroy the Christian religion as far as it lies within their power to affect its welfare, consign us all to worse than heathen darkness, and remand us to the dungeon of despair.

Weakened by internal dissensions, dismayed by the loss of court favor, driven out among the barbarians, Arianism fell into a decline, and rapidly disappears from the page of history, passing, a century or two later, into utter oblivion, from which it was, however, resuscitated, a thousand years afterward, by Servetus and the Socini, who, along with Bernardino Ochino, gave birth to Socinianism, Unitarianism, and the other forms

of modern Arianism, which almost perished under the inexorable logic of those incomparable English champions, Bull, Pearson, and Waterland, illustrious names! loved and honored by all true sons of the Anglican Reformation, and worthy of being inscribed next below that of the much-enduring hero of the Homoöusion, our Great Athanasius.

CHAPTER IX.

THE FIRST COUNCIL OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

An instructive anecdote is told by Theodoret and others. Amphilochius, Bishop of Iconium, having a certain object in view, upon entering the presence of Theodosius, duly saluted the Emperor, but took no notice of his son, Arcadius, who was seated near him, and had recently been clothed with the purple; or, as another authority has it, actually patted the youth on the head and called him his dear child. This audacity provoking the monarch's indignation, he ordered the presumptuous prelate to be ignominiously expelled from the palace. The order could not, however, be executed before the artful bishop had suggested the words of St. Paul: "And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, *to the glory of God the Father.*" The offender was at once pardoned and received into favor, as he well deserved to be, after having lodged in the imperial breast against Arian dishonoring of God the Son an argument, which time and change served only to establish there more firmly. It is a pity for the dramatic effect of this scene that Arius, or, at least, Eunomius, could not have been introduced as a witness: it would be no mean exercise of ingenuity to put into their mouths a reply that would have stood them in any stead.

Among those that arrayed themselves against the Council of Nice was one who, upon the death of Alexander, contended with Paul for the possession of the archiepiscopal throne of Constantinople, and drew down upon himself such detestation on account of the cruelties perpetrated, by his orders or through his connivance, at the time of his accession, that he was finally deposed. This man, Macedonius by name, was the originator of a new heresy. It is plain that the question of the Homoöusion touches the Third, as closely as it does the Second, Person of the ever-blessed Trinity. At first the discussions did not extend beyond

the essence of the *Son*, the Arians seemingly not caring to divide the attention of the world by introducing another element into the debate, and the Orthodox most gladly refraining from throwing temptation in their way; but such enlargement of the controversy was inevitable. To all those who accepted the Catholic Faith the determination of Nicæa covered the case of the Holy Ghost as completely as that of the Son, for, if the Second Person of the Trinity is *of the same substance* as the First, there is no imaginable reason why the Third Person should not be so likewise. On the other side, the question would be an open one. When the Son is made *similar* in essence to His Father, the Holy Ghost will probably be imagined *similar* only to the former: still he may be put on a par with Him, the same degree of similarity being allowed to both; or He may even be advanced above Him, as would seem an almost irresistible consequence under the execrable doctrine of Aëtius. A high Arian in his views respecting the Son of God, whom he admitted to be like in all things to the Divine Parent, Macedonius adopted the notions of Sabellius regarding the Holy Ghost, maintaining that He has no proper individual existence, but is an energy or influence pervading the world. Nevertheless, the views of Macedonius seem to have fluctuated considerably, turning now towards the one pole of doctrine, and now towards the other; as was very natural in a prelate who, at one epoch of his life, courts the favor of the Catholics, and at another is a disgraced fugitive from their righteous indignation. His heresy was never very threatening. No Macedonians are heard of in the West, and the sect expires soon after it has effected the one good it was calculated to bring about, the rounding of the Nicene Creed by the addition of a paragraph concerning the "Lord and Giver of life." The Christian world always will marshal itself in hostile ranks about the great question of the Eternal Essence, but the battle seems destined to be fought out on the ground afforded by the revelation of an incarnate God, and only an occasional skirmisher will wander off into the less attractive, and less accessible, regions of speculation about the substance and nature of the Sanctifier.

The keen and self-confident intellect of Arius had scaled the loftiest heights of theology. If the work of irresponsible exploration was to be continued, pioneers must content themselves with inferior altitudes. From speculating about the substance of

Deity, an easy step is the one to philosophizing about Incarnate Divinity. It being granted that the Son of God always was perfect God, the next question is, Did He assume perfect humanity? His flesh, doubtless, was ordinary human flesh, and it was animated by a soul at once sensitive and rational; but was there over and above these the third part of man's complex nature, the intuitional, immortal part, which alone is strictly *spiritual?* Is it reasonable to believe that the perfectly excellent essence of the Infinite united itself with an inferior spiritual nature; that the inflexible, and all-righteous, and absolutely disinterested Will of God bound itself by the ties of a common personality with the weak, imperfect, easily biased volition of the creature? What need was there of such an alliance? Was not the innate Divinity competent to fulfill all the functions of the higher spiritual nature? Must not the indwelling Divine Substance, indeed, merge into itself all other spiritual being within the same personality, so overawing it that it would fall upon its face as dead, utterly unable to execute one single office? Such reasoning is neither without force, nor lacking in seductiveness; though it does not stop where we have tried to stop it, but properly, when once admitted, goes on to deny the Saviour a *Soul* as well as a *Spirit*, the true and efficient Will, for instance, being a faculty rather of the former than of the latter. Truly, such an incarnate God would not be incarnate at all in the sense that He became a man among men, experienced their trials, obeyed their law, bore their sins, and died their death. He would be God *tabernacled in flesh*, but *not* God tabernacled in *manhood*, which term is evidently synonymous with *flesh* in such a connection, in which it denotes the whole human organism, of which it is a part and for which the word is used by metonomy; a position which is strengthened by the consideration that it would have been of no avail that He should become *flesh*, unless He became man utterly. The first, as far as we are informed, to preach the doctrine to which we allude was, strangely enough, an ardent admirer of the great Athanasius, and had once enjoyed the honor of intimate association with that illustrious man during a stay which he made in Laodicea upon one of his innumerable journeys. Disciples, however, very frequently fail to reflect accurately the doctrine in which they have been instructed. It often happens that distortions of a system are caused not so much by perversity of intention as by imperfectness of comprehension or

inaccuracy of memory. Apollinarius of Laodicea displays in his conduct none of the qualities that belong to the leader of heretics, unless an invincible love of knowledge be numbered among them: on the contrary, when he had been very harshly treated by the weak and arrogant George, bishop of the city, he meekly continued to implore forgiveness and restoration, till the inexorableness of his superior drove him to despair. His chief fault may be conjectured to have been a too exclusive and absorbing pursuit of secular learning, to the neglect of studies more suitable and necessary to his exalted calling; since he was very fond of the Grecian classics, incurred the episcopal displeasure by attending a lecture of the sophist Epiphanius, and invented for himself a theory of the Incarnation which perhaps betrays too great familiarity with mythological fables concerning the descent of gods to earth. If a Christian priest admires and studies Homer more than St. John, he may become a composer of beautiful hymns, but runs a fearful risk of being given over to the delusions in which he revels.

As Apollinarius is said not to have admitted any fusion or commingling of the two natures in Christ, thus rejecting a necessary deduction from what he certainly did hold, it is proper to inquire how far any one, and especially a teacher, is to be held responsible for logical inferences. This much-vexed question allows, if we are not greatly mistaken, of a very simple solution, based upon the obvious distinction between the man and his belief. The impetuous accuser who insists that the founder of a new sect must believe everything which seems to flow, as a logical sequence, from the doctrines he proclaims, is bound by the same reasoning to exonerate him altogether; because if a man must be taken to hold a tenet or a doctrine merely because logic deduces it, then must he be wholly incapable of falling into error, inasmuch as true logic never can become the pillar and buttress of falsehood. In all charity and fairness, no matter what glaring inconsistencies may lurk in any one's creed, he ought not to be held accountable for any deductions but those he himself draws. With respect to the new theory itself, the case is very different. That theory, when firmly established in the hearts of the multitude, becomes an entity as much as if it were real flesh and blood, and will be delivered of a progeny. Though the mastiff wear the lion's hide with triumphant art, it will procreate curs, and not whelps. When the adder is abroad, we fatally delude ourselves in calling it a

harmless garter-snake. Therefore the theory or the doctrine which can only bring forth confusion, immorality, and falsehood ought to be treated with no delicacy whatever by those whose hearts yearn for the welfare of Christendom, but be freely exposed and forcibly repressed by every lawful means. Apollinarius is not to be accused of holding what he distinctly repudiated; but Apollinarianism must carry the weight of every error to which it gave being, or towards which it leaned.

The heresies of Macedonius and Apollinarius required authoritative answers, having risen into such prominence that they seemed to threaten the very life of Orthodoxy, unless they should be promptly stigmatized and crushed. Had they come against it, they two alone, Orthodoxy, it is true, need hardly so much as have turned its face towards them; but when they advanced beneath the banners of Arius, or in close league with so vigorous a foe, the matter became incomparably more serious. Besides the urgency of this peril, further occasion for the assembling of a second council was found in the need of reäffirming the doctrine of the first, which had been violently and persistently impugned by so numerous and wide-spread a faction. Creed after Creed,—this closely resembling the Nicene, that widely departing from it while retaining the same general arrangement,—had been promulgated by synods, Arian confessedly, Arian covertly, Semi-Arian, Catholic, and mixed, till men's minds had become greatly confused, and the unlearned might almost be pardoned if they professed themselves unable to distinguish, in this Babel, the ancient tongue of the true Children of God. It was high time that the Church should again put herself on the record, proving to the world that her faith had not been changed by all this uproar, and guarding her sons against fresh error that had lately arisen.

Yet gloomy forebodings must have troubled the leaders of the Catholic Church when looking forward to the probable conduct and action of another Council, should one be convoked in submission to the evident demands of the situation. So altered had become the position of Christianity in the world that, instead of a meeting, from far distant regions, of saints and heroes, scarred, bruised, maimed, and disfigured by the terrible ordeals which had beautified and strengthened the soul even more than they had marred and weakened the body, the convocation would be one of dignitaries who, in many respects, were hardly distinguishable

from the pampered, proud, and profligate senators, consuls, and commanders of the decaying empire, and were far more likely to display the violent passions which make theological debate so fruitful in asperities, than the humility, mildness, and charity which certainly ought notably to characterize those who preach to the populace the religion of the Crucified. Various causes worked together in thus demoralizing the Church, among which two are worthy of remark. The sad consequences of the marriage consummated by the great Constantine have already been dwelt upon. It must be seldom that a pious husband or wife will not feel disastrous effects from union with an ungodly partner,—disastrous to the spiritual tone of the life. When such connections are brought about by events over which the suffering party had little or no control, grace sufficient for the extraordinary need may doubtless be expected; but when the son or daughter of God allies himself or herself with one who is an alien from the commonwealth of Israel, who cares naught for God or religion, who is a devotee at the shrine of this world's deity, in that case has there not been a tempting of God, a presumptuous casting down of one's self from the pinnacle of safety, and a consequent forfeiting of the promised angelic ministrations? The great society of the baptized did not cease to be God's Church when it lowered itself so far as to crouch beneath the imperial Ægis, but it did subject itself to incalculable danger from too close contact with the world, from the contaminating touch of wealth and power, and from the insidious temptation of depending for safety and success upon the assistance of the government. Behold the event! Who could hope to sit secure as archbishop of Constantinople if unacceptable to its Lord and King? What remains for Paul or Gregory, for Chrysostom himself, let the imperial brows once knit against him, but to come down from his seat and surrender the staff which God and His Church have intrusted to him? Let him be ever so clearly the very man designated by supereminent ability, and fervid eloquence, and popular favor to rule over the greatest city of the world as its pastor and guide; let him be the leader of public sentiment throughout Christendom and the most dreaded foe of heterodoxy, still, if my Lord the King thinks that his posture is a trifle too rigid, down he must be dragged at once, in order perhaps to make room for a successor only distinguished by his incompetency, corruptness, indolence, and indifference. That this is no fanciful

picture is witnessed by the whole history of the period, and especially by that portion of it which relates the strifes for the possession of the greater sees. Prosperity wrapped its deadly coils about the Church, and mangled, though it could not slay her. Effeminacy, cowardliness, love of the world, desire for ease, craving for display—these were no unimportant auxiliaries in the evil work. Without secular assistance, the Church would have increased more rapidly, exercised a more undisputed influence, and have been more fruitful in works of piety, than it was with it; but that prosperity would not have been of the same kind, nor have wrought such evil. The prosperity which injured the Church was not different from that which sapped the empire: it was one which involved the possession in great abundance of the good things of this life.

If the primary cause of the religious retrogression was the Church's union with the World, the second is to be looked for in the long continuance of the Arian strife. Religious discussion is not unattended by evils. In the heat of debate the antagonists will say and do many things repugnant to their own sense of propriety. Involved in continuous argumentations, polemics will become oblivious of the practical significance of the very things about which the war is waged so hotly. It would seem to the modern who reads of such a rapid succession of synods and councils, who is told that the public service suffered serious inconvenience from the monopolizing of roads and beasts by eager ecclesiastics thronging to the fray, who is perplexed by the effort to keep the track of the various shadings and colorings of heresy which perpetually annoyed the faithful, and who marks the frenzy which apparently had seized upon the great majority on both sides, as if for the half century between the Councils of Nice and Constantinople, the whole mass of believers did little else than wield, furbish, or whet the sword of controversy. Such a state of affairs cannot be healthful. The fathers who sat on the banks of the Bosporus came not, as they whose hall was swept by cool breezes from the Ascanian Lake, from tending their flocks with peaceful assiduity, accustomed to be startled now and then by the wild beasts' roar, and sometimes to be themselves mangled by their cruel fangs, but otherwise to act the part of unwarlike shepherds: they gathered from provinces and cities rent and torn in the mad warfare of fanatics, habituated to the battle-cries of contending factions, taught to fence with the sharp weapons of logic, not unused to see

the grosser missiles and implements of carnal contention employed in adjusting controversies concerning the Essence of God, till streets ran with blood, and other sights, yet more abominable, offended the eye of Heaven. Fifty-six years of internal strife had not been without their deteriorating effect upon the Church. Whose was the fault? Was it her own fault that "Homoöusion" and "Homoiousion" had become the battle-shout of hosts and the rallying-cry of mobs? Had she erred in insisting upon psychological distinctions, when prudence, common-sense, and divine command obliged her not to make the door-way quite so narrow? Not so. The wolf and the bear must be excluded, even if you are compelled to contract the entrance to an inconvenient narrowness. Yet the fault was her own: she ought not to have closed with Constantine's alluring offer. Had she retained her independence, Eusebius and Arius scarcely could have made head against the overwhelming odds. Their only hope from the beginning drew its inspiration from the court. It was court influence and imperial power which drove the catholic and orthodox prelates out of their churches and installed heretics in their stead. What was the arm which excluded Athanasius from his proper seat for twenty years? What hand scourged the refractory bishops at Rimini into compliance with the will of the Arians, holding them there in captivity till they yielded to the cajolery of a clique? What power stood behind the heretical faction when it rose in Antioch or in Cæsarea, in far Cappadocia, by the blue Mediterranean, or where the pent-up waters of the Black Sea sweep past the Golden Horn? Valens, or Constantius, or Constantine was punishing the Church for her blindness when he sent forth his decree, or dispatched his messenger, or marched his troops against her peace and her interests.

Under such unfavorable auspices must a Council be held, if at all. Might it not, then, have been more prudent to defer for awhile the calling of it, till at least some portion of the intense polemic excitement had subsided? The Church was not left to decide this question, but was relieved from the responsibility by the issuing of a royal summons to the bishops of the East to assemble at Constantinople, in the year of grace 381.

The choice of place was a natural one. Not only was Constantinople the very seat of the Macedonian heresy, but the theatre of the whole Arian struggle had in a measure been erected within its precincts. Then, too, New Rome was the darling of the

Eastern Empire, already outshining the ancient city of Latium, and designed to become the metropolis, as well as the capital, of the world. Well had Constantine judged when he determined upon that site, by the shores of the Bosporus, for his intended city. If Alexandria bears testimony to shrewdness and foresight in the heroic Macedonian, Constantinople witnesses yet more eloquently, by her rapid growth, wonderful prosperity, and astonishing longevity, to the genius of the victor at the Milvian Bridge. Situated where two continents approach within a mile and a half of each other, and close by the deep channel which connects several immense bodies of water, possessing, moreover, an excellent harbor, she had but to open her hands and grasp the commerce of the world. Why should not Religion avail herself of the ships, caravans, and emporiums of commerce? Thitherward flowed naturally the concourse of divines as to the centre of trade, art, literature, learning, and theology.

The motives which actuated Theodosius in convening this council were possibly as pure as those which moved the first Christian emperor in setting him the example; though there may not have been wanting among them a desire to emulate the fame of his greater predecessor. Theodosius, it may be, thought that his name would go down to posterity as that of the Restorer of Catholicity and Second Father of the Church, shining with even brighter effulgence, as that of the Overthrower of Arianism, than had it fallen to his lot to accomplish the easier task of demolishing a superstition already worn out, like that of pagan Rome when Constantine applied his torch to the tottering fabric. Nor can the one great blot upon his escutcheon, the massacre perpetrated by his order at Thessalonica upon a promiscuous multitude, be considered as proving him undeserving of the peculiar favor with which he has always been regarded by the Orthodox; for that horrible deed was provoked by a gross popular outrage upon the representatives of the crown, was little more than an oversevere execution of justice, and was bitterly repented by the excommunicated sovereign standing stripped of his regal ornaments, an humble suppliant for pardon and reconciliation, publicly soliciting with sighs and tears, within the church of Milan, from the clemency of St. Ambrose the removal of the sentence which barred him from the altar. Theodosius was almost an exemplary sovereign, stained with none of the private delinquencies, and

scarcely with any of the flagitious crimes which befouled the reputation of his illustrious predecessor. The choice of a Spanish provincial by Gratian as partner of his throne and ruler of the East, withdrew him from the elegant and comfortable retirement of agricultural pursuits, to which he had betaken himself with singular prudence and self-control when the ingratitude of the government slew the father who had already made the name of Theodosius illustrious by the victorious generalship of more than one arduous and difficult campaign; and plunged him forthwith into the toils and perils of the Gothic war, which his prudence soon brought to a fortunate conclusion. From this time till the death of Valentinian II. his reign was marked by generosity and magnanimity towards a weaker colleague, temperateness, except in the few instances in which he was hurried away by passion, as in the well-known case of Thessalonica, a general regard for equity, and by prudence, foresight, and wisdom. He at last found himself undisputed master of the Roman world, but did not survive that event long enough to satisfy us that his hand was sufficiently firm and skillful to guide the chariot of state without assistance in such troublous times. Indeed, it is more than probable that he would have taken counsel rather of indolence or prudence than of ambition, and allowed his sons to reign independently over distinct portions of the empire. No incident is recorded of this great prince, the last who reigned over the undivided realm, more to his credit than his returning to Valentinian the provinces from which he had been expelled by the usurper Maximus, and adding to them those which that tyrant had seized in the reign of Gratian; and this, although he held Valentinian wholly in his power, and his own unaided prowess had destroyed the usurper. It is no ordinary character that can practice such self-abnegation under circumstances of peculiar temptation.

If any emperor was to manage ecclesiastical affairs, Theodosius would be less likely than almost any other to control them to the detriment of the Church. Besides the virtues with which he had adorned his private station, and which he did not shake off with the ordinary garb of the farmer, he possessed the additional recommendation of being a staunch Catholic. A most objectionable custom of the age having delayed his baptism till he had reached mature years, it was not before he had passed through the dangers of one campaign and an illness so severe as to imperil his life, that

he received at the hands of Ascholius, the orthodox bishop of Thessalonica, that regenerating sacrament which should have sanctified his infant days. From that moment the whole weight of his influence was cast upon the side of those who held to the Homoöusion, and not infrequently the stress of his wrath descended upon the contumacious heretics, as he doubtless regarded them, who stubbornly remained Arian after he had denounced their impiety. Imperial edicts attached the penalties of exile, fine, and confiscation to the reception or conferring of heretical ordination; prohibited all meetings for purposes of heretical worship, and declared forfeited the building or ground so desecrated; placed all heretics outside the pale of the law to a great extent, shutting them off also from all prospects of civil employment, disqualifying at least one class from making their wills, and inflicting capital punishment upon those who dared to entertain the impious tenets of Manes, or to celebrate Easter according to a very ancient custom. While we cannot avoid feeling disgust at such tyrannical and absurd laws, we must attribute much of their objectionable features to the spirit of the age, and exonerate Theodosius from the charge of having been intentionally cruel and domineering. We ought also to remark that, by sinking under these oppressive edicts, Arianism showed that it did not possess the vitality which may reasonably be expected in a sect really battling for the truth of God.

When Theodosius, yielding to a request to have disobeyed which would have been to throw away his life, mounted the throne of Valens, the Goths had lately routed the army of that Arian tyrant, and slain him on the disastrous field of Hadrianople. Under Fritigern these valiant barbarians were already giving auguries of the days when Alaric should thunder at the gates of the Eternal City. From the banks of the Danube and the distant tracts of Mœsia they had gradually moved forward towards the seat of dominion, till now, allied with the savage hordes of Huns, Alani, and kindred tribes, they had actually advanced their front within sight of the gates of Constantinople. At such a juncture was Theodosius summoned to the field. During the continuance of this life-and-death struggle, and probably taking advantage of the leisure afforded by a slight lull which attended upon the formation of a treaty of alliance with Athanaric, the leader of the Ostrogoths, he turned aside from the anxieties of warfare in order

to set on foot measures for promoting the welfare of the Catholic Church. This compact must have been ratified about the beginning of the year 381, and in May of the same year the council assembled at Constantinople.

Neither in numbers nor in dignity does this assemblage deserve to rank on a par with that great First Council about which so much interest has always centred. Some one hundred and fifty bishops presented themselves, with the learned and famous Gregory of Nazianzum at their head: in addition to these orthodox prelates, Macedonian bishops to the number of thirty-six had obeyed the summons of Theodosius, who hoped that they could be brought to accede to the demands of the Nicene Christians. The picture of this synod painted by the competent hand of its president does not impress us with the feeling of respect and veneration which should attend such a gathering of dignitaries. We are thrown back upon the reflections already detailed concerning the deteriorating effects of the union of Church and State. In their synodical letter, the Constantinopolitan fathers dwell upon the hardships which they had been called upon to bear in defense of the faith. Without at all doubting their veracity, and having fresh in our memories the persecutions suffered by Athanasius, Hosius, and other champions of the Homoöusion, we must be permitted to doubt whether very many of those bishops had really undergone torture or endured exile, and also to remark that, even if they had, they had probably not borne their afflictions in quite the same spirit as those who had been cruelly treated by the heathen. In the latter case there would be the quiet resignation of men who, conscious of their own helplessness, bowed to the will of Heaven; in the former, something at least of the restiveness, combativeness, and lingering ferocity of those who expected presently to gain the upper hand themselves.

It is not fair to compare these ancient synods with the conventions of modern times without making some allowance for the former. Sorrow and shame depress the mind of the churchman who revolves therein the undignified and even uproarious scenes that cast so dark a shadow upon the celebrated gatherings of the Church at Ephesus and loaded with reproaches the name of another Alexandrian bishop, the famous Cyril; meditates upon the melancholy fact that hardly a single synod, large or small, can be acquitted of similar misconduct; or hears that Gregory Nazianzen

speaks in reproachful language of the very meetings over which he himself presided. Did not Gregory's brush color a little too highly? Even if it did not, one reflection intrudes itself upon us which at least serves to explain the unfortunate circumstance without smearing the grouped faces with one hopeless daub of black. Parliamentary law, as we now call it, does not seem to have been generally understood. The Romans, being prœminently a people of law and order, doubtless observed certain well-defined methods of procedure in their comitia, in their courts of justice, and in transacting the business which came before the Patres Conscripti. The same genius of organizing must have presided over the informal meetings in the *fora* and *porticoes*. Nor had the spirit of method deserted its old haunts as yet in the era of the General Councils; an era which was remarkably productive of legislation and of codification, as the very mention of the names of Theodosius and Justinian must remind every student of history. Notwithstanding this predominance of the legal idea, it does not seem that there then existed a recognized system of rules which were applicable to any meeting for debate, discussion, or the arrangement of general affairs. If such a manual did exist, it was not introduced into any of the ecclesiastical synods, as far at least as our knowledge extends. Lamentable experience has taught mankind that the only safe course is to observe the etiquette of debate, and to have that determined by the absolute voice of a presiding officer, who pronounces his decision subject only to a formal appeal to the entire body, basing it upon a recognized code of regulations. Unfortified by such a rampart of published rules and regulations almost universally observed, the president of one of those early councils soon found his position forced whenever unusual excitement reigned, and himself obliged to withdraw and await the advent of a partial calm, which was not to be expected till the combatants had expended their energies, or some fortunate circumstance had diverted their attention from each other. Even if, then, we are not permitted to excuse these tumults by referring them to the character of an age in which, the force of coherence having shown itself unable to bind together securely such vast territories and such different races of men, the various elements of destruction were gradually working up to the surface of society, and already creating that ferment which was to result in the disruption of the empire; if we are precluded from pleading such an

excuse in behalf of men who were the chosen leaders of a body of their fellow-mortals that was supposed to stand apart and separate, in professed subjection to a King who inculcates the virtues of meekness, brotherly-love, and mutual forbearance; we are nevertheless fully justified in urging on their behalf the mitigating circumstance that human ingenuity had not yet devised a Manual of Parliamentary Law. Let the harsh critic who would scathe all those holy men with his sweeping condemnation, let the sad-hearted Christian whose reluctant eye drops a tear upon the page which tells the story of the Robber Synod, remember that these were assemblies in which men came together to pronounce judgment upon questions which to them were of paramount importance, upon which they had meditated till the dizzy brain fled from thought, and which they had defended with all their best powers for perhaps two generations; and that these assemblies were not managed according to any clearly-defined system. He who has had the slightest opportunity of observing deliberative gatherings, knows that no test of temper equals the strain and excitement of a warm debate. The weightier the question, the deeper it stirs the soul. The profoundest questions of theology seem to hold suspended the world's destiny, and to authorize the employment of any means, fair or unfair, in getting them properly decided. The debater who is thoroughly persuaded that the victory of his opponents is a triumph of Hell, and is equivalent to the signing of an eternal death-warrant for incalculable multitudes, is not likely to view with equanimity the artifices of the other party, or be sparing in his denunciations of the wrongs which he sees or dreads, or to be conciliatory in his bearing towards those whom he accuses of perpetrating or intending injury to the truth. It may well be doubted whether a concourse of the worthy and pious men who now rule over the Anglican Communion, would escape our strong disapproval for having indulged in very unseemly behavior, should they venture to throw aside the safe-guards of Parliamentary Practice, and conduct their sessions under the lax regulations of the ancient councils. Bishops, however tried and true, are still but men, so that it need not astonish us if they sometimes exhibit the passions and weaknesses of men. If, when the distance and feebleness of the central authority have encouraged cities to undertake the administration of their own affairs at the cost of frequent seditions, an occasional prelate puts

himself in alliance with a mob, or at its head, in order more to protect himself and his church than to annoy or oppress others; or if, in the heat of discussion, language escapes the lips of an anointed shepherd which would shock his ears coming from his own sheep, and deeds of violence are committed by him in the terrible earnestness of his convictions from which the colder zeal of mercenary demagogues would shrink amid the tumults of a political meeting; in either case we are not permitted to write the offender down an unreclaimed ruffian or an odious hypocrite. Some allowance should be made in accordance with the considerations just advanced. At Nicæa the awful presence of the Emperor tempered the discussions to a mild and healthful warmth. At Constantinople a less commendable state of things prevailed, but it is not to be credited that the clamors were literally like those of magpies or geese, or that the members were a set of coarse, rude savages. We feel fully warranted in maintaining that the assembled bishops were, in the main, men for whom the Church need not greatly blush.

A brief sketch of the chief character may be useful as illustrating the period. The remote province of Cappadocia gave, in that age, to the army of the Lord three of its ablest leaders, who were knit together in the closest ties of affection. Of these, Basil first rose into prominence as Bishop of Cæsarea (in Cappadocia), in which position he attained great distinction for ability in the pulpit and on the platform, for skill in ruling his province, and for the persuasiveness and force of his literary productions. His younger brother, Gregory, made bishop of Nyssa, in the same province, was so highly esteemed in his own day that a council of Antioch commissioned him to make a general visitation of the churches in Arabia; and he is still frequently referred to by those who do not scorn to drink of the stream of theology near its source. The other Gregory was the brother-in-arms of his great contemporary: together they pursued the studies of a liberal education at some of the most famous schools of the time, and especially at that of Athens, in which they were fellow-students with Julian the Apostate, then a mere youth like themselves; and together they retired into ascetic seclusion in Pontus. Their separation was effected when Basil, upon his own sudden elevation, intent upon increasing the number of bishops in his province, rather unscrupulously condemned his friend to the oversight of

Sasima, a wretched little town about thirty miles from Tyana. Thence, or rather from his retreat at Selencia, he was summoned to undertake the important and difficult labor of bringing Constantinople back to the Orthodox faith. In accomplishing this, his eloquence and manly policy were so successful that he soon heard himself nominated by the general voice as patriarch of that city. The council, being then in session, took up the cry, and Theodosius himself, having sent a detachment of the imperial guard to wrest the Cathedral of St. Sophia from the Arians, led Gregory in triumph through the thronged streets, and seated him upon the throne from which the heretic Damophilus had just been driven. This sudden exaltation might well have intoxicated the humblest mind, but the heart of Gregory still beat as true as in the days of his lowliness. Not the learning, not the mighty eloquence, not the immortal writings, of this saint envelop him in so bright a glory as his conduct when circumstances dismissed him into obscurity almost before he had tasted of the delicious cup just lifted to his lips. The Egyptians were, for some reason, hostile to him, and revived against him the old prohibition of *translation;* whereupon, with excusable indignation, Gregory offered to retire from his throne. His offer being promptly accepted by both council and emperor, the archbishop quietly put off his robes, laid down the key of his palace, spoke his farewell to weeping thousands, trampled his hopes under foot, and retreated to his native Nazianzum, which was destined to share the undying fame of its noble son,—never nobler than when, almost without a sigh, he turned his back forever upon the scene of his short-lived distinction.

Whatever may be the opinion of posterity concerning the Council's action in substituting the senator Nectarius for Gregory Nazianzen, and in promoting the perjured Flavian to the episcopal see of Antioch, it must be admitted that the conclave transacted most creditably such business of lasting moment as came before it. Besides dignifying the bishop of Constantinople, as befitted the growing importance of that city, with the next place after the bishop of old Rome, the Second General Council adopted three measures that intimately concerned the welfare of Christendom: (I.) first, it reäffirmed the doctrine and Creed of the Council of Nicæa; (II.) secondly, it condemned Macedonianism, declared the divinity and consubstantiality of the Holy Ghost, and enlarged

the Creed by expanding the third paragraph so as to contain an expression of the full belief of the Catholic Church regarding the Third Person of the Holy and Ever-adorable Trinity; (III.) and, thirdly, it also condemned Apollinarius and the false teaching which denied to our Lord the possession of a human spirit.

How can the claim of this council to Œcumenicity be established, in face of the fact that it was an exclusively Eastern gathering? That it did not contain Western bishops was the result, not of hostile purpose, but of circumstances. The Sovereign, at whose behest it was convened, then reigned only over those provinces which belonged to the government of the Orient; and in consideration of the fact that the great Arian emperors, Constantius and Valens, had preceded him in ruling over that portion, he could not be expected to see the necessity of asking Gratian to unite with him in calling the chief pastors of the churches within their respective territories to a combined synod, the principal object of holding which would be to extirpate a heresy which scarcely existed in the dominions of the Occidental monarch.

We are thus compelled to behold the Church divided into two nearly equal parts by a well-marked line of division. The later civilization of the ancient world belonged to two distinct types corresponding to the two dominant races which had their homes, in historic times, upon the two peninsulas which prolong the southern shore of Europe so far towards the inhospitable coast of Africa. Issuing from one great parent-stock, the Indo-Germanic, and speaking languages both derived from the ancient Sanscrit, these two races, though each containing a strong infusion of the Pelasgic element, were marked by characteristics as distinct as their tongues. Appearing first upon the historic stage, the Greeks distinguish themselves by their successful prosecution of all pursuits requiring intellectual power, and speedily attained the first rank in literature, philosophy, science, and art. Grecian genius has never been equaled. To select the equals of the poets, orators, sculptors, painters, and thinkers who adorned a small and not over-populated district of country, within the compass of a century or two, we are obliged to ransack the entire world and extend our search through a score of centuries. The Roman lacked genius: his wit, eloquence, and *originality* were borrowed.

Virgil, Cicero, Seneca, what were they in comparison with Homer, Demosthenes, Plato? He did have, however, what, for the practical uses of life, is commonly more useful to its possessor, talent. If, for example, the thought were only furnished him by Æschylus or Sophocles, by Socrates or Aristotle, the Latin could dress it out in beautiful attire, and exhibit it so transformed that the most penetrating would hardly pierce its disguise. One talent in particular seemed inherent in the Latin nature, a talent which marked the city of Rome from the very day of its foundation; which dimly appeared when the Sabine women were seized; which emerged into the light of day as tribe after tribe was swallowed up by the rising kingdom; which shot up in bright flames towards the zenith when Roman arms subdued, and Roman policy converted into allies and subjects, the nations with which they came in contact; and which shone with steady and ever-increasing lustre while a system of government was being devised which should knead and compact the vast dominion into one organic whole. As a soldier or as a legislator the Roman, with his wonderful skill in organizing, never has been excelled. Along with this talent went appropriate qualities of soul, courage, firmness, sturdy loyalty, inflexible determination; qualities without which the mere skill would not have availed much.

The mutual action and reäction of natural constitution upon language and of language upon natural constitution, is too complicated a subject for present investigation; but the *fact* nearly concerns us that the two languages also had their distinguishing marks. As a medium for conveying abstract ideas and fine distinctions, the Greek was incomparably superior, so that, even if a man made the attempt to philosophize in Latin, he soon gave it up in disgust at the clumsiness of the tools with which he was obliged to work. The mere deficiency in the vocabulary might, perhaps, have been made up in course of time; but in order to equalize the Latin with the Greek, and give it the wondrous flexibility of the latter, nothing less would have had to be accomplished than its total recasting. The musicalness and stateliness of the Roman tongue fitted it tolerably well for the forum and the senate chamber; but what could it do in the *stoœ* without an Optative Mood, an Aorist Tense, or the marvelously expressive Particles that convey with such accuracy each nicest shade of meaning?

The conquests of Alexander had carried the Grecian language and Grecian civilization beyond the Indus, and established them so firmly in Egypt, Syria, Asia Minor, and in other regions of the East, that the Romans never supplanted them with their own, genius herein exhibiting greater strength and tenacity than the organizing talent. The advance of the Roman legions towards the far north of Germany, across the breadth and length of Hispania and Gaul, and even into the British Isles, had reduced the continent of Europe under the dominion of a civilization almost purely Roman. So, then, the empire naturally tended to break across a median line, being Greek as to the Eastern portion, and Latin as to the Western.

Now, it is to be noted that Providence seldom bestows upon the same man lofty genius and estimable qualities of soul. Genius is usually unstable, if not fickle. Where the character is not lacking in earnestness, perseverance, and courage, pride very often mounts upon its back the man of mighty intellect, and soars with him into the forbidden regions of dangerous speculation. Whatever objectionable characteristics entered into the composition of the Greek were aggravated by long contact with Asiatic effeminacy, till the good were greatly obscured, or wholly lost. Enervated by a relaxing climate, infected by the bad example of the indolent inhabitants, the Greek of Antioch, or Iconium, or Chalcedon, or Constantinople, was not the Greek of Athens, Sparta, or Corinth: yet he inherited a dialect which almost compelled him to become a philosopher, and more or less of the noble qualities which had graced his ancestors while they dwelt among the mountains, and tilled the sterile soil, of Attica and Lacedœmon.

When Christianity was brought to these two races, it was received by them in accordance with their natural peculiarities. The Greek seized upon the wonderful truths which it revealed, sought adequate expression for them in the rich treasury of his incomparable mother tongue, compared each with every other, in order to ascertain the exact limits of all, and then wove them into beautiful systems wherein the splendor of each was enhanced by the radiant loveliness of the rest. Origen or Dionysius had at his command a language in which he could easily express any thought that the human mind had ever conceived, without inventing new words, or having recourse to cumbersome paraphrases;

one, too, which would enable him to follow up any thread of investigation into regions of which the attenuated atmosphere refused to support human respiration. It hardly needs to be added that the Greek-speaking race supplied the Church with her theology, at least so far that it pursued all investigations, and furnished all the arguments upon which a question was to be decided. Unfortunately, however, Greek genius being yoked with Oriental fickleness, serious deviations from the direct line of truth were often threatened and narrowly escaped. There was manifested among the Oriental sages too much of that restless and unbridled spirit which wandered perpetually after "some new thing." Without the bold and strong-pinioned Greek intellect, Christian theology would have traveled along contentedly upon such low levels that the vigorous mind must have turned away from it with a feeling of unconquerable repugnance; without the bulwarks thrown up around it by that philosophic race, it must have lain exposed to the deadly attacks of the first heretic who assailed it with skill and determination. On the other hand, unless it had been restrained by some invincible force of conservatism, not improbably some new Socrates would eventually have been raised by Attic fervor upon a loftier pedestal than St. John's.

With all the clumsiness and the poverty of a language which had no word for *Saviour*, and in which *Pœnitet me* had only the force of *I regret*, with all the stolidity of mind which failed to produce one single independent thinker of eminence, the children of the Eternal City could yet boast the inheritance of certain sterling characteristics which are really more valuable and more honorable than the keenest insight, the widest grasp, and the most sustained activity of mind. The Roman of the Decadence, however degenerate, was a descendant of the Scipios, Catos, and Bruti of the Republic, men who could neither be bought nor intimidated, who embarked in a cause with all their souls, and adhered to it till death set them adrift, who seized a standard with such unyielding grasp that the bleeding stump was often found clinging to it on the battle-field. He could still be loyal, sturdy, invincibly brave as of old. Satisfied with *the old*, which he had thoroughly tested, which had grown into his very life, around which his affections had learned to twine themselves, he was not eager to exchange it for something else, merely because that would be *new*. If penetration and originality distinguished the Greek, the

equally valuable qualities of calmness and impartiality in judging, deliberateness in acting, and tenaciousness in maintaining honest convictions, marked the Latin as his peer in the Church of God, one who might set him an example as well as learn a lesson in divinity from his lips. The one soared high in air, the other marched laboriously over the rough highway; but the former gained little either in distance or renown by a flight from which the proud bird was often obliged to alight, and tarry for the advance-column of its slower ally, in order to make sure that it was steering its course in the right direction.

In order that the Council of Constantinople should be entitled to the name Œcumenical, it is not necessary that it should have contained delegates duly appointed and duly certified from every separate portion of Christendom, any more than that it should have been an universal mass-meeting of Christians; nor is it requisite that a general summons should have been issued and conveyed to every member of the episcopate; but it was sufficient that it should comprise a respectable number of bishops in communion with the Church, provided their action in matters of general importance should afterwards be honored with the stamp of universal approval. In the case before us, the fact of this general approbation is placed beyond the reach of doubt. We need not inquire into the date of the synodical letter to Damasis, Bishop of Rome, Ambrose, Ascholius of Thessalonica, and the other bishops assembled at Rome, professing to have been written by the orthodox bishops "convened in the great city of Constantinople," nor as to whether any, and what, reply was made; for we have one unanswerable proof that the Council was acknowledged throughout the Christian world. If the Council of Nice was a General one, so must also that of Constantinople have been, since the latter altered a decree of the former, and the alteration was adopted everywhere. The first set forth a Creed, and commanded it to be received, without addition or subtraction, under pain of damnation; the second added almost an entire paragraph to this universally adopted formula. A General Council could take such a step with entire propriety, upon the principle that no legislature can bind succeeding legislatures by passing an irrevocable law, but no inferior authority could do so without incurring the announced penalty: therefore, as the Creed of Constantinople universally took the place of that one which had been promulgated by the

earlier synod, the Church at large manifested its acceptance of the later synod's coördinate authority. In the face of the fact that the enlarged formula gradually came to be recited publicly in all the orthodox churches, it sounds strangely to hear learned men say that the Œcumenicity of the Second Council was not generally acknowledged

CHAPTER X.

THE COUNCIL OF EPHESUS.

At a bend of the river Orontes, where it breaks through the parted chain of Lebanon and Taurus, covering a plateau on the left bank of the stream, extending its streets to an island in front, and creeping up the precipitous slope of Mount Silpius, which shuts off the southward view, stood the famous city of Seleucus Nicator, the capital of the dynasty to which he belonged, and for awhile the successful rival of Damascus as metropolis of Syria. Beautifully situated, adorned with one of those interminable colonnaded streets that embellished Tyre and many another Syrian city, filled with magnificent buildings, numbering probably about half a million of inhabitants, and not undistinguished in point of culture, Antioch was no unworthy competitor with Alexandria for the queenly diadem of the Mediterranean. The experience of Julian when he took up his temporary abode among the Antiochenes on his way to his fatal campaign against Sapor, and of Theodosius, when, goaded by heavy taxation, they overthrew and ignominiously treated his statue and those of the royal family, seems to justify the general opinion of their contemporaries, which stamped the citizens of that metropolis as indolent, luxurious, effeminate, and fickle to the last degree. In such a community learning must be cultivated under great difficulties. The prevailing effeminacy, impurity, venality, and general unhealthiness must infect the intellect more or less. Still, philosophy flourished extensively in many an unwholesome atmosphere during the long period of Rome's decline. We have already taken a glance at the early history of Pantænus's celebrated Catechetical School, and seen it transformed gradually into a close resemblance to our modern theological seminaries. In Antioch arose, somewhat later, a similar school, destined to vie in reputation, and to strive for the palm of controversial victory, with the Alexandrian. At the head of it appeared,

in the latter half of the fourth century, a man of some note, the same who as Diodorus, Bishop of Tarsus, sat in the Second General Council. It was his good fortune to have for pupils the "Golden-mouthed" John (surnamed from his eloquence *Chrysostom*), the peerless preacher of Antioch and stern patriarch of Constantinople, and Theodore of Mopsuestia. Presently the pupils become masters, and in the room of the scholar are found Nestorius, future patriarch of Constantinople; John, soon to be set over Antioch itself; and a famous author, Theodoret of Cyrus. The fundamental difference between these two great Christian schools seems to have been that, while the more ancient one adhered to that mystical method of interpreting Scripture which had so notably characterized its great disciple, the "Adamantine,"—which was always delving for hidden treasure, in contempt of the literal meaning that lay before the reader's eye,—the more recent one had hit upon a sort of *Via Media*, or middle way, between bald literalism and the vagaries of untrammeled mysticism; a method which has since gradually grown in favor till it has won an almost undisputed sway over the learned biblical scholars of England and Germany, establishing itself upon a general survey of entire passages and a *critical* examination thereof by the aid of grammar, history, geography, antiquarian research, and philology.

Scorning the odds of numbers, Alexandria evinced no hesitation in combating single-handed the entire East. She affected to look down contemptuously upon the upstart importance of Constantinople, pretending to regard the court limits as coterminous with the precincts of the city, and all the inhabitants, from the humblest frequenter of the church of St. Sophia up to the patriarch himself, as sycophants and truckling courtiers. The natural jealousy of commercial emulation had been intensified and embittered by the sharpness of the Arian controversy. Therefore, when Nestorius ascended the throne of Constantinople, concentrating in himself two such causes of animosity, it is not strange that the hostility which had led Theophilus to depose Chrysostom at the Synod of the Oak, broke out with increased fury, now that a prelate of no gentle and yielding temper ruled the fierce mob of the *Eclectic* city at the mouth of old Father Nile.

As Cyril of Alexandria plays such a conspicuous part in the history of the Third Council, we may say a word about him at

once. Few men among those who have received the honor of canonization have come in for a larger share of abuse than this prelate. Indeed, much of his conduct was such that the most ardent friend of orthodoxy would be averse from undertaking to defend it. Being the nephew of his immediate predecessor, Theophilus, who had invaded Constantinople with a large retinue of ecclesiastics and a body-guard of Alexandrian sailors, and almost dragged the immaculate bishop, noblest orator of all the fathers, from his seat, Cyril seems to have inherited the vices of the haughty and violent relation whose movements he accompanied all the way to the Golden Horn and the suburb of Chalcedon. A sojourn of five years among the recluses of Nitria served (it may be no breach of charity to say with his friend, Isidore of Pelusium) mainly to feed his spiritual pride; and a severely contested election certainly had not softened his disposition when he felt himself secure upon the lofty seat to which he had aspired. It is not denied that he dealt cruelly with a very peaceable set of Christians,—the inoffensive Novatians,—shutting the doors of their own churches against them, and confiscating their sacred vessels. His lawless act in forcibly expelling a colony of forty thousand Jews, must have been exceedingly distasteful to the many among his own zealous adherents who had profited from the industry and wealth of that people. The prefect, powerless to coërce the mighty ecclesiastic, sent a complaint, which scarcely reached the deaf ears of Theodosius, but rebounded upon the head of Orestes himself, bringing against him five hundred of the monks, who scattered the guard, assaulted his chariot as he drove through the city, and covered his face with the blood of stone-bruises. Whether Cyril hounded on these savages or not, he made himself an *accessory after the fact* by paying unusual and unmerited honor to the corpse of the ringleader, Ammonius, who was buried with all the ceremonies due to martyrdom. The story of Hypatia, the justly-celebrated lecturess in philosophy, has been so well told by Charles Kingsley that we will not delay upon it. Her utterly causeless murder by Peter the Reader and a mob of parabolani was not, it may be, directly instigated by their bishop, but posterity will never be persuaded that a large share of the responsibility for the atrocious, unmanly, cowardly deed did not rest upon his shoulders. It is also said that the patriarch freely expended immense sums of money in purchasing the favor and

support of those who had influence at court; and there can be no doubt of the truth of this heavy accusation. How Cyril is to be exonerated from these terrible charges we cannot conjecture. Granting that he was actuated in all these misdeeds by a vehement desire to advance the interests of his church, we still say that insurrection, arson, deadly assault, murder, bribery, general oppression, and conspiracy are not light offenses, to be blown away with a breath. Cyril may have been a brave, intelligent, and learned man, and a skillful politician; but before he can be pronounced an ornament of the episcopal order, the ineradicable moral ideas of mankind will need to be revolutionized completely. If the patriarch of the great orthodox Alexandrian Church was better fitted to act the part of Fritigern or Genseric, of Brutus or Rienzi, of Marius or Pompey, than to sit in the chair of St. Mark, we need not defend him: he was but a man. Let him go! The worst creature may be an implement in God's hands to accomplish great results. Neither the validity of episcopal authority, nor the just value of the Ephesine canons, depends upon the character of Cyril. Let him pass, unvarnished, for what he was.

Controversies concerning the Incarnation raged just as hotly after the Council of Constantinople as before. For those who submitted their own judgments to that of the great body, two doctrines concerning the God-man, our Blessed Redeemer, had been established, that He was perfect God, consubstantial and coëternal with His Father, and that He was perfect man, lacking no part of triplex human nature. Was there, then, no change produced in either the Godhead or the manhood by their conjunction? When the chemist has ascertained the appearance and properties of all the simples, he can yet form no idea what the result will be of compounding them. For example, Oxygen is a substance most necessary for the support of life, and Sulphur is not particularly deleterious; but mingle one part of the latter with three of the former, and you have the powerful poison, Sulphuric Acid, which seems to retain few, if any, of the characteristics of its elementary constituents. To compare great things with small, does no fusion or commingling take place between the two natures in the God-man? Such was the question which next came to the surface: how should it be answered? The Scriptures could hardly be expected to supply any direct answer: they would, and did, speak of Christ, while on earth, sometimes as a man, ascribing to Him

the characteristics of man's finite and limited nature; and sometimes as God, attributing to Him the glorious and stupendous characteristics of the Infinite Nature: beyond this, into regions of speculative philosophy, they did not go. Still the question was of immense importance, since the obvious consequence of fusion would be to destroy, at least partially, one or the other nature, or both, and thereby overthrow the validity of the Atonement. As it is hardly supposable that the immutable attributes of the Deity should undergo alteration of any kind, the human nature would be the one affected by the commixture; but the moment this change should take place the humanity would disappear as to its entirety, leaving behind certain portions only of its mutilated organism. Indeed, it does not seem clear but that as, on the one hand, the mutilated nature would be converted into something else by subtraction, so on the other, the absorbing essence would be converted into something other than itself by addition; and that therefore the grand resultant would be a *third somewhat*, neither divine nor human. There is this to be said in behalf of the *fusion* theory, that it is difficult to imagine that even perfect, spotless humanity could endure the unveiled presence of divinity, and that the incomparably greater is likely always to overshadow the less, and gradually mould it into a likeness unto itself; which is certainly truth, though not in the realistic sense in which its advocates must be understood to speak. Perceiving the evil tendencies of such a theory which are open to the view of any person who will devote a serious thought to the subject, and perceiving apparently that some such ideas lay latent in the Apollinarian heresy, the great Antiochene doctor, Theodore, who was afterwards bishop of Mopsuestia, took refuge in a theory which may be styled the Contradictory-opposite of the one he sought to subvert. In order to protest most effectually against the doctrine of one nature compounded out of two, he resorted to that theory which not only preserves the distinction of the two natures, but distinguishes also between the personalities. In this Cerinthus had been his forerunner, he teaching that the Æon Christ descended upon the man Jesus at His baptism, and left Him again prior to His crucifixion. Theodore certainly stopped much short of that blasphemy, for His preëxistent being was no Æon, but the eternal, *homoöusian* God, and, according to him, the union, taking place at the moment of conception, was to continue forever; and

yet his main thought, the separation of the personalities, *might* have been suggested to him by a perusal of Irenæus's exposition of the Cerinthian heresy. Allowing that the man Christ Jesus was not an individual being, since He was possessed of a double personality, the next step is to determine the character of the connection between the two persons; for some connection there most assuredly was. Conceivably it might be nothing more than that which exists when the Holy Spirit dwells within the believer. Theodore did not take that view of the union, but declared that it was higher and more perfect, while he insisted that it was not a personal one at all, but merely a friendly association, or at most one of affection and will. How such an explanation could be made to agree, for instance, with St. John's declaration that the "Word became flesh and dwelt among us," or how a valid atonement could be based upon such a union of friendship, the learned man never showed. Evidently, if God the Son was a separate individual from Jesus the son of Mary, then the son of Mary was a mere man, a pure and righteous man, but no more; and consequently his death could no more have blotted out the transgressions of our fallen race than that of any other creature could have done. The Arian with a leaning towards orthodoxy would probably have to surmount fewer intellectual obstacles in accepting the consubstantiality of the Son of God, were He understood to be united with the visible and mortal Christ only by the no-union of friendship; but his adherence would be gained at the price of a subverted Faith, for the Christian religion can stand on no other basis than that of a genuine personal union, which constitutes the exalted being at once God, with no attribute lost, and man, with none of his qualities merged; or what is called in technical divinity the Hypostatical Union.

This system of doctrine we have ascribed to Theodore of Mopsuestia, because he was really the originator thereof whether he actually held it himself in its entirety, or not. From him it was learned by Nestorius and Theodoret of Cyrus, the former becoming its great apostle upon his promotion to the see of Constantinople. Nestorius seems to have been a vain, impulsive man, lacking in self-control, though not devoid of talent, energy, and eloquence. There had followed him from Antioch a presbyter in whom he had chosen to put much confidence, Anastasius by name, who took occasion one day in a sermon to condemn an expression

which was in vogue among the Catholics. Nestorius supported him, and created great excitement by delivering a course of sermons in which he trod the same path; and was accused by Eusebius of Dorylæum of reviving the ancient heresy broached by Paul of Samosata, who had taught, in the third century, that Christ was a mere man upon whom descended a certain divine influence which endowed him with extraordinary gifts. The commotion soon extends its concentric waves across the sea, and arouses the impetuous Cyril, who is seen to leap up and bound forward with the joy of a charger who scents the battle.

The term against which exception was taken had the sanction of Athanasius, most orthodox of men, of the two Gregories, and even of temporizing Eusebius Pamphilus, none of whom had scrupled to call the Virgin Mary *Theotokos* (θεοτόκος), or *Mother of God.* He who should surmise that the approaching contest is to turn upon the honor due to the Blessed Virgin would be guilty of mistaking Ephesus for Trent, and the fifth century for the sixteenth. It is true that the Church had never intermitted its deep respect towards her who was chosen for the exalted privilege of giving birth to the Lord of glory, had never forgotten the congratulatory tone of the angel Gabriel's salutation; "Hail thou that art highly favored, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women;" and had as far as time permitted verified her own prophecy, "From henceforth all generations shall call me blessed;" and it is not to be denied that a growing reverence for the Virgin-mother pervaded the ranks especially of the celibate clergy and the monks, whose natural affections, forbidden to display themselves as the Creator designed, turned spontaneously towards any object that could even partially appease the yearnings of their hearts; but it is certain that the Nestorian controversy did not hinge upon the question of duly honoring the Virgin, but upon that of the Hypostatical Union.

The phrase was a favorite one in Alexandria, where it was used against the Arians as an assertion of the full divinity of the Saviour. What was born of the Virgin was the manhood: if, then, the Virgin were called Mother of God, no better method could be devised of proclaiming that Christ was both man and God. No one who used the term meant to declare that Mary gave birth to His Godhead, an idea both absurd and blasphemous; but simply that, while she was distinctively the human parent of

His humanity, that holy thing which was born of her was "Emmanuel," *God with us*, "Jehoshua," *God our Saviour*. It may be objected that, unless Mary was the mother of Christ's divinity, we ought not to call her the Mother of God. Those who adduce such an objection either forget what is signified by *Personality*, or else believe, with Theodore and Nestorius, that He was not a single, but a double, person. Of course, if the Lord had within Him two distinct individualities, as well as two separate substances, then what happened to one of the allied individuals did not affect the other, unless it happened also to Him: if the Son of God conjoined Himself with a preëxistent (existing before the union) man, then the sufferings of the man were no more the sufferings of God, in strict propriety, than the hunger or fatigue of Jonathan was the hunger or fatigue of David. On the contrary, in the same way that the whole man is cold when his body is, or sleepy when his brain is, or penitent when his soul is, or angry when his heart is, just so the *whole Christ*, God and man, did whatever either nature did, or suffered whatever either nature suffered, and in general was affected by whatever touched either side of his duplex personality. Is this a quibble? So, then, is it a quibble to say that whatever modifies in any degree one part of the body necessarily disturbs the whole. If you plough a man's back with a rawhide, do you not torture *him?* If you fill his stomach with an abundance of savory dishes, do you not feed him? If the hangman breaks the spinal cord, do we say that he kills only the body? If he does not kill the soul, he does kill the person whose the soul and body are. The grand principle, which is known as that of the *Interchange of Attributes* (Communicatio Idiomatum), is that that which can be predicated of either nature can be predicated, not of the other nature, but of the person who possesses them both and is made up of them both. Thus, when the Master lay in the hinder part of the storm-tossed bark, it would be improper to say that the Godhead or divine nature was asleep, but entirely consonant with the Scriptures to record that God was asleep, for such an expression does no violence to the fact, unless St. Paul erred when he spoke of the "Church of *God* which *He* hath purchased with His own blood." And now we have pierced to the marrow of the whole subject, since, unless *God* died for man, man is not saved. This was the very reason that the eternal and only-begotten Son of God dwelt in the virginal womb;

He thus humiliating Himself in order that He Himself, and no one else, might be capable of suffering and death. As the learned and pious Hooker teaches us, the infinite nature endured no intrinsic change whatever by the incarnation, neither was the human altered by His assuming it, only the latter was dignified and perfected by the union, and the former, though not lowered at all, acquired capacities far beneath it, such as those we have mentioned, which could be best obtained in that way. In fine, while no one would have committed the gross mistake of calling the blessed Virgin mother of the divine nature, the most rational, cautious, and orthodox might justly entitle her Mother of God, and might properly insist upon such phraseology as an excellent defense of the Unipersonality and of the Atonement, and peremptorily reject the Nestorian substitute *Christotokos*, or Mother of Christ, as insufficient, and even as partaking of heresy when intended as a denial of the *Theotokos*.

The controversy being now fairly kindled, the first step was that of an appeal by both parties to Celestine I., the bishop of Rome. It is almost amusing to observe the deference so skillfully manifested by the haughty prelate of Alexandria in his address to the great patriarch of the West. Cyril's conduct in the affair shows conclusively that he was perfectly capable of curbing his violent temper whenever his interest demanded of him that sacrifice. Strange as such a reference may seem to us, it was most natural under the circumstances. A number of causes had united to raise the Roman bishop in the estimation of mankind, and to give him a very decided influence throughout the Christian world. The first of these was the preëminent importance of the city over which he ruled. It is impossible that great and concentrated communities, compacted within narrow limits, possessed of the usual facilities afforded by such condensation for interchange of the products of mind, artistic skill, industry, and nature, should not rule the districts in which they are. It never has been otherwise, and never will be, so long as talent and genius flow as naturally towards such centres as the produce of market-gardens, of factories, and of broad and fertile acres tends irresistibly thitherward. As Rome, therefore, was the greatest city of all antiquity, her influence would be the widest and weightiest, her prestige remaining almost untarnished long after the Port of Ostia had begun to lament over the decreased shipping. Religious influence, being subject

to the same general laws as any other species, would emanate in equal degree from the great cities; an assertion which is supported by the fact that the five patriarchates were ranked, in utter disregard of considerations which might be thought paramount, precisely in accordance with the importance of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. A second cause was that, when Maximian fled from the sturdy independence of the Senate and people of Rome, in order that he might inscribe himself *Imperator*, in an absolute sense, upon the baths and public buildings with which he adorned Milan, and when Honorius ensconced himself behind the impassable marshes of the Po, removing his capital to Ravenna, they left the Bishop of the Seven-hilled City to gather around his own head all the traditional and actual glory of the world's metropolis. Every visitor who came thither, impelled by curiosity or lured by hope of profit, found the successor of St. Peter exacting more homage than had been willingly conceded to any Cæsar or Augustus of all the long line. Whatever eye turned from the most distant province towards the ancient seat of empire, was caught at once by the brightness which had removed from the deserted residence of the Antonines to hover above the rising state of the episcopal palace. A third reason of the growing importance of that patriarchate was that it had none to dispute with it the allegiance of the West; that while four rival patriarchates divided between them Egypt, Syria, Asia Minor, and the remaining portions of the Greek-speaking empire, Rome was, as of old, queen of the whole vast, loyal Latin world from Carthage to Arles and Corduba. A fourth may be found in the circumstance that her isolated position had helped to keep her aloof from the undignified quarrels which had too often weakened and debased the ambitious potentates of the East. The fifth, and one of the most noteworthy, rests upon the undeniable excellence of many early occupants of the bishopric; not that they were men of extraordinary ability, only that they were almost invariably characterized by respectable attainments, fair average endowments, and, above all, by unimpeached orthodoxy. While few of them had risen above mediocrity, scarcely any, perhaps none, had failed to reach it; many had won the amaranthine crown of martyrdom; and there was hardly an instance on record in which their voices had not, upon opportunity, been given clear and strong for that view of doctrine which has received the approval

of the ages and been stamped as Catholic Truth. Cyril might, then, without ignominy, have honestly deferred to the judgment of the great Latin patriarch, who, as bishop of the world's metropolis, could properly claim the first place among his brother patriarchs, and, as successor of a long roll of worthy and orthodox witnesses to the Faith which was once delivered to the saints, might well challenge the attention of Christendom.

Celestine responded to Cyril favorably, and even presumed to appoint him his delegate to execute the sentence of deposition pronounced against the patriarch Nestorius by himself and a Roman synod, to take effect in case he should not retract within ten days. John of Antioch and other Eastern bishops, in reply to letters which Cyril had sent to them, condemned the course which had been taken by the accused. At this stage of the proceedings a royal mandate, issued jointly by the two monarchs, summoned a general council.

With Valentinian III., then emperor of the West, we have little concern, but in Theodosius the Younger we are interested as the one under whose auspices the whole question of the Nestorian controversy was argued by the parties thereto. The reader who is familiar with the history of James I. of England, will have little difficulty in forming an adequate conception of Theodosius II. Like the royal Stuart, this grandson of the great Theodosius was an exemplary, devout, scholarly man, little fitted for holding the helm of state; an occupation for which he had little ability, and still less inclination. Fortunately for the dominion, the talents of the family had descended to Pulcheria, who for nearly forty years ruled in the name of her brother. There was no variance between the real and nominal sovereigns in regard to piety and orthodoxy, both being unswerving and enthusiastic in maintaining the Homoöusion and the entire Catholic belief. However, it seems a just subject of regret that the reins of power were held in a hand slack enough to permit the Alexandrian prelate to adopt such a domineering and violent course as would speedily have brought down upon him the mailed fist of a more vigorous ruler. We may conjecture that the sad scenes of Ephesus would never have occurred, had Constantine or the great Orthodox Emperor still held the throne on the other side of the Bosporus.

A more convenient place could hardly have been chosen for the holding of the Third General Council than the city so famed for the

worship of the goddess Diana. Lying among and upon the hills near the mouth of the Cayster, Ephesus was readily accessible from both of the great maritime emporiums, while, by means of the two great roads, running to Sardis and thence northeast towards the provinces on the Euxine, and to Magnesia, and from that city to either Syria or the far East, it could easily be reached by John of Antioch and the other Oriental dignitaries. Nestorius displayed his vain confidence by presenting himself on the ground more than a month earlier than the appointed time, which was Whitsuntide, A. D. 431. Cyril was careful to arrive promptly, bringing with him a large company of bishops and an imposing phalanx of followers. Memnon, who occupied the chair of Timothy, St. Paul's beloved son in the faith, gathered about him forty of his suffragans. Celestine was to be represented by two bishops and a presbyter. Theodoret, whose name now appears among the most noted leaders of the new heresy, was present from Cyrus. And Candidian, count of the domestics, was in the city, commissioned to act as a sort of chief of police. Two hundred bishops were already assembled, but John had not yet accomplished his thirty days' journey by land from the banks of the Orontes, though a letter from him had been received signifying his purpose to attend. As the patriarch of Constantinople was to be arraigned before the Council, the presidency, which would otherwise have been his, devolved upon Cyril as the next in order. His first act does not impress us with a sense of his fairness or of his regard for the requirements of courtesy. Although John of Antioch, with some fourteen bishops in his train, was known to be within a few days' journey, and notwithstanding that he had politely given written expression to his regret for his tardiness, Cyril, having too much reason to think that his brother of Antioch did not altogether coïncide with him in his opinions, or at least did not altogether approve of his conduct, resolved, if possible, to hurry the whole matter through before the Syrians could interfere with his plans. Overriding the protests of nearly a third of the bishops, of Nestorius, and of the Imperial Legate, Cyril convoked the Council on the 22d of June in the very church which was supposed to have contained the mortal remains of St. Mary. That one day sufficed for the condemnation of Nestorianism and the deposition of Nestorius himself, his sentence being signed by one hundred and ninety-eight bishops. John, arriving on the

fifth day, was much incensed by the disrespect that had been shown him, and shocked at the hastiness with which such important affairs had been transacted. With his own followers, and others who had joined his party, he held an opposition council, which received a report of the late proceedings from Candidian. It retaliated upon Cyril his own measures, condemning and deposing him and Memnon, but contenting itself with passing the gentler sentence, upon the rest of the two hundred, of excommunication till such time as they should consent to condemn the anathemas of Cyril and his Alexandrian synod. Both parties appealed to the court: however, with regard to the orthodox, it can hardly be said that they went any further than merely to ask imperial favor and countenance, for they absolutely declined to argue their case before the emperor, insisting that, the Council having spoken, the matter was *res judicata*, a *thing determined.* The commissioner made his report. On the 10th of July a second session was held, the Western deputies having arrived. These were warmly welcomed, and gave the approval of the Latin Church to the measures of Cyril. The bishops were obliged to endure the extreme heat and close confinement of Ephesus during the remainder of the summer: they passed the time in hurling anathemas, if not more substantial missiles, at each other's heads, and enacting scenes that among Christian men are only possible when the strongest passions of their natures are aroused in defense of a holy cause, which seems to them to be in deadly peril unless their arms hew down its assailants. The Alexandrian party, exulting in numerical superiority and in at least partial victory, was in no temper to make the conciliatory advances which it could so creditably and gracefully have offered; while the Antiochene displayed an obstinacy not calculated to invite to such a step. Meanwhile the former was slowly winning the ascendency at Constantinople, overcoming soon the prepossession which Candidian's report must have created in any unprejudiced bosom against the precipitancy and harshness of its action. The principal agencies in working this change were, to speak honestly and plainly, fanaticism and bribery. For reasons already suggested, the monastic orders were eager partisans of the Theotokos. Upon the receipt at Constantinople of a letter containing an account of the proceedings in Ephesus, the monks rose in mass and marched to the palace, with a noted abbot as their chief spokesman. As an

angry mob is not to be safely disregarded even by the most popular and potent ruler, Dalmatius and his fellow abbots were no despicable auxiliaries of Cyril and Memnon. But there is a force which may claim greater efficiency than even fanaticism, one which seldom fails, when judiciously and unsparingly applied, of removing every obstacle that can be interposed by custom, tradition, self-respect, fear, the spirit of justice, resoluteness, obstinacy, anything, in short, but firm religious principle supported by divine grace. If Cyril stooped to the free employment of money in buying up influential persons about court, his success was assured before he made the first movement. One, however, did not need to be bought of those nearest the royal ear, for Pulcheria had taken offense at some act or speech of Nestorius. Finally the emperor prorogued the assembly, without definitely declaring in favor of either side, but suffered Cyril and Memnon to retain their sees, and Maximian to be consecrated patriarch of Constantinople.

It is hardly possible to regard this council with complacency. The sight of holy fathers-in-God so demeaning themselves as to compel the civil power to interpose and incarcerate them, marching through the streets with bands of sailors, peasants, or monks at their heels, to fight over the sublimest dogmas of our holy religion, adorning each other with such epithets as only ruffians use towards those who have incurred their hatred, and expending vast sums of money contributed to the Lord's treasury by the liberality of the faithful in purchasing court influence, is not an attractive one. Is it not possible that the dark pigment has been too lavishly employed in depicting the Council of Ephesus? One incident looks that way, the difficulty found by Cyril and his adherents in getting their letter into Theodosius's hands. Why, we at once ask, if they could have so little to urge in their own defense, was Candidian so anxious to suppress the missive? Why was it thought necessary at last to enclose the epistle in a hollow staff, and entrust it to a beggar? Was this an artful device, a mere feigning of duress? Into such questions we will not enter, for, let Cyril be as bad as fancy can paint him, he may nevertheless have been on the right side, and have achieved a real victory for the truth, since evil men are sometimes right, and may assuredly be used by their Creator as tools with which to work out His all-wise plans; and let the council have been ever so unfair, irregular, ill-conducted, it may still have truly uttered the witness-

ing voice of the Church, as long as the theory stands unshaken that the one thing which constitutes a council Œcumenical is that its decisions should have been accepted by the Church at large. We are not obliged to maintain the justness of Nestorius's condemnation, nor the propriety of Cyril's anathemas, but may frankly confess that the accused was probably not guilty of the great aberrations from the faith which were laid to his charge; and that his accuser manifested the extravagant malice of personal enmity rather than the reluctant indignation of one who seeks to reclaim and not to punish; and yet hold firmly to the authoritativeness of the Council as to those points of fundamental doctrine upon which it did speak. There has been no permanent gift of discerning spirits confided to the Church, nor is there any reason to think that the whole Church might not be mistaken as to the guilt or innocence of even the most widely known of all her sons; there has been no promise made to her that she shall never adopt rules of discipline or forms of worship that are not the most advisable, so that it should be disloyal to believe that she has given her sanction to measures of ritual or discipline which a little foresight would have taught her to shun; but there has been an assurance given her that she shall not err in vital doctrine, and in that respect, and that alone, we ought to confide implicitly in her determinations. Her function is to *witness* unto the truth,—not to *make* truth, scarcely even to reason about it,—but simply and chiefly to declare what it *is*, what was entrusted to her safe-keeping as the revealed truth of God. As long as she confines herself to bearing such testimony, she ought to be heard with the deference due to a divine oracle, though the instant she treads outside of this domain we may claim to examine her action, and weigh her reasons. When the Council of Ephesus, witnessing to the truth of the Incarnation, sanctioned the use of the term Theotokos, it defined authoritatively the Catholic Faith, provided the Christian world should add its approval of the decision; but when it condemned Nestorius as a heretic, it was exposed to the usual risks of a human tribunal, and may have pronounced a sentence wholly unjust even to that vain and arrogant prelate.

The skeptic may amuse himself by slyly aiming the shafts of his ridicule at the *Inspiration* of such a synod, seeming to ask all the time that he is recounting the unseemly incidents of its sessions, Does this look as if God had much to do with the direct-

ing of these deliberations? or, while he is dilating upon some of the wretched quarrels that filled up the time of the bishops' long sojourn, Are these the deeds of reverend prelates in whom dwells the plenary gift of the Holy Spirit? Let us not be disturbed by such questions, whether they be the sneering objections of the scoffer, or the honest interrogatories of those who desire to obtain correct views of a matter not often understood. Undoubtedly, these men did possess no small share of God's grace. The official acts of Cyril, or Nestorius, or Memnon, or John were just as effective as though suspicion had never breathed upon their fame; and if the men could convey the grace of regeneration, of consecration, and of ordination, why should they not be capable of accurately declaring what doctrine they had received from those who had gone before them? With the instances of Balaam and Caiaphas staring us in the face, can we deny that the Almighty sometimes chooses to speak by the mouths of bad men? Was not Judas an Apostle? Let it, however, be clearly understood that the authoritativeness of the decisions does not depend upon any special inspiration residing in the individual members, or in all collectively, but upon the indwelling of the Holy Ghost within the entire Church. The inerrability was located in the corporate body; which was not assembled at Ephesus, but was scattered over the world, and was not involved in the disgraceful proceedings of the Council. The vast numbers of Christians who had remained at home, upon hearing with grief of the lamentable occurrences at Ephesus, would be liberated by such intelligence from those feelings of reverential regard which would have powerfully influenced them to receive without close scrutiny the determinations of a large, learned, able, pious, and *well-conducted* assembly, and would be moved to examine with unusual care whatever was put forth for their acceptance. Therefore the very circumstances which are dwelt upon as undermining the authority of the Ephesian Council ought, perhaps, to be taken as placing the correctness of its action in condemning the doctrine of the two-fold personality upon the most immutable of bases.

Separating without having reached a friendly understanding, the members carried with them back to their homes, to be disseminated among their flocks, the animosities which had blazed up so fiercely and burned on so relentlessly. Prompted by a desire to appease a strife injurious to the public welfare, and by

the pious hope of realizing the promise made to those who shall play the part of mediator, Theodosius nobly strove to reconcile the hostile parties, and at last had the reward of seeing the two leaders bury their weapons. The pacification was almost a complete triumph for Cyril, as he did little more than explain what he meant by certain phrases which he had used, while John actually gave his approval to the condemnation of Nestorius and the ordination of Maximian. These concessions displeased both sides, Isidore of Pelusium taking Cyril to task, while Theodoret rebuked John for deserting the deposed bishops. However, by the assistance of the civil authority, the treaty, made in 433, was enforced, and unity was restored about two years later, the flames of discord being smothered, at least, if not extinguished.

Nestorianism itself did not die thus easily, but retreating to the eastern confines of the empire, found an asylum in the school of Edessa, Ibas, bishop and master, patronizing it, and greatly aiding its spread by the translation of some works of Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia into Syriac. It is not to be supposed that this heresy was thoroughly suppressed in the Eastern empire by the adverse edicts of Theodosius: on the contrary, every province contained probably some congregations which refused to surrender their belief in the friendly union of the two personalities. Still, henceforth the heresy flourishes mainly in the far East, beyond the Euphrates. Edessa became a hot-bed for the nurture of missionaries, who covered Persia and Assyria. In the year 435, this school being temporarily disbanded by Rabula, its head, who was a strenuous advocate of the unipersonality, Barsumas, one of its members, retired to the celebrated city of Nisibis, which had been the bulwark of the Roman *imperium* against the Persians till it was ingloriously ceded to Sapor by Jovian. Being bishop of that place, he became the foremost of the Nestorian leaders, secured for his sect the protection and favor of the Persian king, Pherozes, and obtained for it a thorough and firm establishment in his realm, with its patriarch (called by the name of Catholic) holding his seat in the twin cities, on opposite banks of the Tigris, Selencia and Ctesiphon. He also founded another seminary of devoted missionaries by erecting the important school at Nisibis. Feeling assured that the attachment of the Nestorians to their own sovereign had been forever destroyed by the harsh treatment they had received, the throne of Persia smiled upon

them with peculiar benignity. Between this auspicious circumstance and their own unbounded zeal and self-sacrifice, their creed was introduced everywhere with marvelous celerity and success, so that in the course of a few centuries it had spread into almost every corner of the vast Asiatic continent, and promised to subjugate the many myriads of inhabitants which throng its various countries. Even the Celestial Empire in vain interposed the barrier of its exclusiveness against their onward march, and was invaded by them through the port of Canton. A khan of Tartary becomes, in truth or fable, converted by them into that notorious personage, Prester John, whose portable altar accompanied him in his marches. The ancient superstition of the Brahmins was almost as powerless to check their advance as Persian Magism had shown itself; for when the Portuguese first pushed their adventurous prows to the coast of Malabar, about the year 1500, they found there a flourishing community, calling themselves Christians of St. Thomas, and acknowledging allegiance to the Nestorian patriarch of Mosul. Whatever may have been the exact tenets of the man whom history has designated as their founder, the sect, after some disagreement between those who merely said that the nature of the union between the two persons was *unknown* and those who positively affirmed that it was nothing more than one of *will and affection*, speedily settled down into a final and complete adoption of the latter view. Not caring, it may be presumed, to be known as the theological offspring of any man, these heretics rejected the name Nestorians, desiring to be spoken of as *Chaldaic Christians*.

We may justly lament that so much ardent zeal and apostolic piety were lost to the true Church, and feel tenderly towards an error which was productive of so much good in bringing so many thousands out of heathen darkness into the partial light of their Christianity. We may even be tempted to think that a false doctrine which has given birth to so much courage, love, and energy cannot be very inferior to the true; and that we must be mistaken in supposing that it is really hostile to belief in the Atonement, whereas it has preached Christ for many centuries with a zeal that rebukes the coldness of those who hold a purer faith. Let us, therefore, remember that the argument which proves Nestorianism as good as Catholicity just as easily shows that Buddhism or Mohammedanism, with their proselyting ardor and

rapid spread, are as good as Christianity. If Nestorianism enjoyed a remarkable share of the divine blessing, was it not because, with creditable inconsistency, its advocates taught the Christian religion more correctly than they themselves held it? Can we tell what would have been the results had the whole Church tacitly adopted the tenet of two persons in Christ? Has not the sect been preserved by the unacknowledged and unsuspected influence of the Catholic Church from straying yet farther away from the truth? Instead of ridiculing the Fathers of Ephesus for stickling about a matter far too unimportant to justify them in driving a large number of earnest Christians out of the fold, let us rather direct our strictures against the ungodly temper manifested by those who should have been to the flocks patterns of all the virtues. What might not a little exercising of forbearance, patience, and self-control have effected in winning back such as had begun to stray? If, instead of flinging sharp missiles at each other, Cyril, Nestorius, and John had approached one another in the spirit of brotherly love, might not the whole dispute have ended at Ephesus forever? Cyril and John at least appear to have been separated by very slight differences of opinion, and to have been kept apart mainly by official jealousy. Would that no bishops had ever lifted themselves above their peers to such a height of power and worldly magnificence! Would that the Church of God had studiously kept aloof from all the allurements of earthly ambition! The wrong was not in valiantly or steadfastly maintaining the truth that in Christ our Lord exists only a single person composed of two natures, nor in insisting that all who hoped to enjoy the advantages of communion must accept this doctrine and profess it too, but in contending for it with arrogance, bitterness, contemptuousness, and injustice; which crime perhaps lies at the doors of some of the staunchest and most orthodox champions of the Unipersonality.

Nestorianism at last met an antagonist too powerful for it to vanquish. When the locusts of Mohammed swept like a plague over the Orient, many waving fields belonging to that religion were devoured by them. That terrible wind from the deserts of Arabia bore down many a stately cedar of Catholicity, and exposed the roots of many a tall palm of Chaldaic Christianity. The Saracens, it is true, far from persecuting the Nestorians, decidedly favored them above the Greeks, and allowed them to fix the seat

of a patriarch at Bagdad and at Mosul; but their conquest of Persia, and the gradual extension of their religion over the East, cast a blight upon Nestorianism, under which it gradually shrank and decayed. In the Nestorian of to-day, whether reconciled to the Patriarch of Rome or still acknowledging no allegiance except to his own *Elijah* or *Simeon*, or whatever name may be the official designation of his ecclesiastical superior, we would hardly recognize the ideal Nestorian of a palmier day.

The first three General Councils were called upon to defend the faith from attacks directed against that which had been revealed concerning the Son of God. The *Second* had also been obliged to protect the doctrine of the Third Person of the Holy and Undivided Trinity from presumptuous assailants. And now the Council of Ephesus was compelled to condemn another heresy, which corresponded to the Macedonian very much as Nestorianism answered to Apollinarianism, a heresy which, if it did not, like the Macedonian, directly concern the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, could not have been very remote from that subject, inasmuch as it had regard to the universality, necessity, and nature of his working upon the human soul.

Although the new teaching had its rise in the West, being in this particular quite remarkable, it did not originate with the Latin race, but was devised by a member of one of the tribes which inhabited the barbarous countries of Europe when Rome first advanced her eagles into the forests of Gaul and Germania. *Morgan*, transferred into Greek, becomes *Pelagius;* and, meaning *sea-born*, may indicate that the possessor of the name drew his descent from ancestors who pushed their frail barks far out into the treacherous sea, and showed themselves at exposed places visitors as unexpected as they were unwelcome. Such was the name borne by a British monk who, about the beginning of the fifth century, forsook the great monastery of Bangor, or his own lonely cell, to mingle with the throngs of Rome. Finding in that refuge another waif, like himself drifted by the current from the farthest northwest and cast up upon the shore where flowed the "yellow Tiber," a native of Ireland, a genuine Celt, he admitted him into friendship and into an active copartnership in his theological ventures. During the ten years or more spent by these two monks within the walls of Rome, Celestius had ample time and

opportunity for learning the philosophical system of Pelagius, and suggesting such improvements as might seem advisable to a mind sharpened by the training and practice of an advocate.

If Pelagius was not a fellow-countryman of Cæsar and Cicero, that distinction cannot be denied a man who stands foremost among the divines of the Latin Church, to whom must be awarded the credit of at least partially redeeming Latin theology from the contempt to which it might otherwise have been assigned. The illustrious antagonist of the Briton was born at Thagaste, a town of Numidia, A. D. 354, of a heathen father, but of a mother equally remarkable, it would appear, as housewife and saint. Many advantages were lavished upon the youthful Augustine, who was sent to the schools of Madaura and Carthage. His father, finally brought over to the true faith by the influence of his exemplary wife, dying when the boy was about seventeen years of age, the assistance of a rich fellow-townsman enabled him to pursue his studies. The youth was not correct in his habits nor in his faith, committing the double crime of unfaithfulness to both the purity and the religion in which his pious mother must have trained him. At eighteen, though unmarried, he was the father of a boy, who afterwards accompanied him into the Church. It may be thought strange that the reading of Cicero's "Hortensius" should have thrown the young man of nineteen years into Manichæism; but so it happened, that work exciting a spiritual appetite which in his diseased condition the simplicity of the Bible failed to satisfy. For nearly a decade he remained a member of the abhorred and persecuted sect, but gradually contracted an intense disgust at the obscene and hypocritical practices of the "elect," and an inveterate dislike of the system which nurtured them. In 383, he sought a more agreeable field for the exercise of his talents as instructor in the same metropolis at which we left Pelagius and his coadjutor, and thence removed to Milan. In that favored and historic city he had the privilege of testing the justness of its great preacher's fame. The same mighty spirit which awed and subdued the monarch prevailed over the indifference and the prejudices of the dissolute rhetorician, becoming thus the appointed instrument in the divine hands for proving the truth of those memorable words of an aged bishop to the tearful and supplicating parent, "It is impossible that the child of those tears should be lost." Monica rejoiced to number her son among the catechumens.

Slowly he struggled upwards under the load of bad habits and cherished unbelief, till at last a voice came, or seemed to come, to him in an hour of extreme mental anguish, bidding him "Take up and read," and sending him to St. Paul's Epistles, which he happened to open at the appropriate passage: "Not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying; but put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh to fulfill the lusts thereof." On the anniversary of our Lord's sabbatical rest in the tomb, in the year 387, Augustine, his son, and his dearest friend, Alypius, knelt by the font at the feet of Milan's sainted Archbishop. Monica not long surviving this unspeakable triumph, her bereaved son remained in Rome for more than a year longer, and then returned to Africa and his native place, where he passed some three years in purifying himself from the old taint by a life of religious retirement. There prevailing in those strange days the antiquated idea that the very best talent and most extensive knowledge should be consecrated to the work of saving souls, Augustine endeavored to shun the fate of Ambrose by immuring himself in seclusion, but in vain, for, happening in an unguarded moment to visit Hippo Regius, the inhabitants presented him against his will to the bishop, Valerius, for ordination. Thus he became a presbyter in the ancient seat of the Numidian kings; which his renown would keep in the memories of men long after Masinissa and Jugurtha should have passed into oblivion. In order that Valerius, a Greek, might be relieved from the task of discoursing in the Latin language, with which he did not feel himself thoroughly familiar, the custom was introduced, before unheard of in Africa, that a presbyter should preach when the bishop was present, and Augustine addressed the people in his stead. At the end of four years another novelty was introduced, that of having two bishops in one city,—in direct opposition to the eighth canon of the First General Council, of the existence of which, however, information had probably not reached the Numidian Church,—and Augustine found himself assistant bishop over one of the most important sees of Northern Africa, which his abilities soon brought into the greatest prominence. In this station he continued for thirty-five years, dying just too soon to throw the weight of his character into the scale of order at the Council of Ephesus, and, perhaps, act as an effectual check upon the overbearing and unscrupulous

prelate of Alexandria. The leadership of the African Church being conceded to him, Augustine turned his influence to most excellent account in both the Donatist and the Pelagian controversies. Having given to the world in his "Confessions" a valuable record of his own spiritual history, in his "City of God" a monument to his fame more lasting than the hardest granite, and multitudinous works, expository, polemical, and other, which it is unnecessary to enumerate, he lay down to rest in 430, to await the consummation of the blessedness of the New Jerusalem, the true City of God; leaving behind him a name which was to be almost the *watch-word* of a prolonged and bitter theological war, and to command respect from all schools of thought, and all varieties of sects. Yet does not our estimate of the Roman race hold good even in his case? Who would think of comparing his learning with that of Gregory Nazianzen, or his argumentative power with that of Basil of Cæsarea? As for soundness of judgment, comprehensiveness of view, and depth of penetration, must we not admit that, even though we should forget the other Gregories, Theodoret, Chrysostom, one man at least dwarfs him into insignificance,—one who took no partial glance at a single side of a subject, but examined all its several aspects, acknowledging their existence, even though he could not precisely account for that existence,—the incomparable Athanasius?

Both Augustine and Pelagius lacked what Athanasius had, whether the progress of intellectual science in his day permitted him to know the fact or not, a true *philosophy*,—that philosophy which is implied in all correct theological teaching, and has controlled the Church's pulpits and councils from the beginning. Augustine and his antagonist did not understand the law of *polarity*, but acted as men who, having discovered *negative* electricity, should insist that *all* electricity must be negative. Arius and Sabellius had succeeded in penetrating the barriers which protect the opposite poles of the great doctrine of the Trinity, and wished to make men believe that they stood above the equator, and could see the entire surface of the globe as it swept beneath their feet. Pelagius and Augustine sailed away from each other, one towards free-will, the other towards absolute predestination, till they attained north and south latitudes, respectively, of at least 70°, and then tried to persuade themselves that, because their adversary's ship had sunk so far out of their sight, it must have

gone to the bottom with all on board. One man discovers the law of inertia, and insists that the planet must fly off at a tangent; the other hits upon the law of gravitation, and takes the opposite position that the body must drop in a straight line towards the sun; and both are equally wrong, as they will see if they trace out the actual course, and follow the huge and shining mass as it rolls along in a regular elliptical orbit, neither flying off only, nor rushing inward only, but doing both at once. What a pity it is that reasoners are so impatient to apply their logic! If modern science should ever succeed in persuading them to restrain their ardor till they have taken careful observations of all related phenomena, it will have achieved enough to entitle it to the lasting gratitude, to the loud plaudits, of all who love truth above victory. Man is like the planet, as a moment's observation ought to show any intelligent person: he can neither fly madly through space at the impulsion of his self-will, nor does he submit to be drawn in towards the eternal and infinite centre of all life by the overwhelming force of the everlasting design; but he describes a path that is the resultant of these two forces. It will perhaps be objected that both parties would have admitted this. Perhaps they would; but the charge is that, having a strong preference for one force, they magnified that force till it virtually extinguished the other, instead of taking both into their calculations, and striving to compute accurately the amount of each. If they did not convert the elliptical orbit into a tangent or a radius, they certainly did change it into a parabola or a hyperbola, and whirled poor human nature among astonished worlds like a frantic comet instead of a quiet, orderly, sober planet.

That man is free is a conviction imbedded in the lowest substratum of our mental nature, and so utterly ineradicable that not all the vagaries of Indian, Arabian, or Grecian philosophy, not all the well-aimed blows of Augustine, Gottschalk, or John Calvin, nor all the speculations of those who make of a man nothing but a nature such as it has been constituted by inheritance and slightly modified by the circumstances of his particular life, have been able to displace it. The very individual who most vociferously professes himself a slave, shows conclusively in his actions and conduct that he believes himself free. Whatever may be the stress of circumstances, however powerful the temptation, to whatever degree the power of resistance may have been weakened by habitual

indulgence, man does not consciously sin without being reproved by his own conscience. If physical coercion is used, or the individual is actually insane, or is possessed by devils, he is not morally guilty of the wicked deed, nor does he experience the same reproaches from within; or if the moral sense has been deadened by a long course in vice, he may not be sensible of the nature of his acts; but in all those cases in which the man really and knowingly offends against the law of right, he is thoroughly aware that the responsibility in the last instance rests upon him alone. Nor is the feeling that of mere shame, nor similar to it. The mental state of the one who has succumbed to temptation is very different from that of him who has been overcome by superior physical force: in the latter case the vanquished may labor under shamefacedness, but he does not bitterly reproach himself, nor feel that he is a vile thing which men ought to shun and Heaven disown. That a conviction of the nature described exists is undeniable: he who should reject it would degrade us into mere puppets dancing on wires, and incapacitate himself for drawing any line between the sane and the insane. A conviction firmly rooted in one person or in ten million may be erroneous, it is true; but one which is indelible in all persons of all ages must be correct. Unless we so conclude, we cut away the ground from under our own feet, and leave ourselves without any knowledge whatsoever; since it is no more certain that cause leads to effect or effect dances attendance upon cause, it is no more clear that we actually exist, than it is that we control our own actions. It may be replied that a patient recovering from typhoid fever, and stimulated by the joyful sense of renewed life throbbing through him with invigorating energy, may think that he can walk, whereas the effort to do so would result in distressing failure. We are not arguing about isolated cases in which men listen to the whispers of hope, but about a deep, and settled, and universal belief which the strongest wind of the desert cannot rend, nor the earthquake overthrow, nor the fire consume, and to which the still, small voice of revelation addresses itself. And what need we care for argument in such a case? The argument overthrows itself, and buries itself out of sight. It overthrows itself because it builds upon the judgment of Causality, which can rest upon no other than this same basis, We believe in it, and therefore it must be true. It digs a pit into which its expiring carcass falls headlong, covering itself many feet deep

with the débris it brings along with it, because it persuades those who will listen to attempt what they cannot do, because it assails the very ones to whom it should look for support, its own kith and kin.

Yet, on the other hand, man is *not* free, and he knows it too. His actions are restrained within very narrow boundaries. If he is pleased to throw a stone, he can do so, but the projecting force cannot by his volition be increased beyond the limits of his muscular power, nor can he cause the projectile to describe any other than a parabolic curve. His capacities are such as the Creator allowed him (whether directly or indirectly, makes no difference), his character, happiness, and success are dependent upon circumstances over which he has no control, and the inherited weakness of his nature renders it practically impossible for him to resist sin without supernatural aid. There is as much truth on this side as on the other. Let not man forget that he is mortal! We venture to say that Plato knew the weakness of humanity, that Cato knew it as well as Cicero; that Seneca, Epictetus, and Marcus Antoninus lamented it with bitter tears; or at least that the first of this trio *wept* what the others deplored,—as far as such demonstrations are supposable in philosophers of the Stoic school. Revelation, probing the wound in order to heal it, removes all the bandages and wrappings, and displays to us all the ugliness of a sore full of corruption. The facts here, too, are clear enough and certain enough: man is what God made him, and too feeble and blind to walk without a helping hand; and the requisite assistance is, according to the testimony of Scripture, freely offered to every man who will ask for it; being even, in a certain measure, forced upon the unwilling, who cannot come to Christ unless God the Father draw them through the Spirit's agency.

Who can reconcile these contradictory facts? No one who has not a stronger intellect than that of Emmanuel Kant; for the difficulty before us is that contained in his Third Antinomy. No wise person will even continue the effort he has begun after he has discovered that the real difficulty lies in the impossibility of comprehending moral freedom, for he will see that he can no more hope to understand his own nature than a dog could reasonably expect to get above the canine nature, and look down into all its valleys and over all its ridges. We can most assuredly form an idea of *freedom* as it exists, but we cannot tell *how* it exists. Here lies

the ultimate difficulty: God being good and all-knowing, and man being His creature, how was it possible for God so to fashion His creature that he could reject the good and choose the evil, considering that He was the all-foreseeing Architect of the mind as surely as of the body, and must have known what kind of a disposition and what degree of determination would belong to it? If a machinist constructs an engine which runs badly, we properly find fault with him for incompetence or negligence, unless the defect was one which no skill nor diligence of mortal man could have discovered. How, then, can the most devout mind exonerate the Deity from blame for creating that which His infallible knowledge must have informed Him would work not only its own destruction, but the ruin of many who should come within the circle of its pernicious influence? Is not this the same as asking why God did not fashion a machine instead of a morally free man? No, because the man might be free to sin and yet never avail himself of that freedom, or if he did transgress, might confine his wanderings within the limits of certain reclamation. Who does not see that this is a mere quibble? Who can repress a smile at the thought of a freedom possessed by countless millions, of which not one ever avails himself? Besides, this theory leaves the difficulty about as great as it found it, for it is equally impossible to understand how God could have made a person who was capable of sinning and must therefore, seemingly, have been imperfect, as one who in positive fact would commit wrong. What is freedom? Let the answer be frank and full: We do not know, we never can know, and we convict ourselves of gross folly in trying to know. Is it, then, impossible that God, good and omniscient, should have formed a sinful creature? No one is in any condition to pronounce it impossible who is unable to prove that a creature cannot be made independent. Why are all the acts of that which is made necessarily traceable to the one who makes it? Why cannot something be formed which shall be capable of being left to its own guidance? That is just what man is, if he is any better than cow and horse, a creature whom God has moulded into His own likeness, placed in a society of his fellows, and permitted to control his own motions and pursue his own wishes and plans. The mystery of his moral freedom must be left unsolved, its solution unattempted save by the folly which under other education and circumstances would set up another Babel for the contempt of

succeeding ages. One of the greatest advantages attending the possession of a powerful intellect is that it teaches where to halt, and so prevents the waste of time, exhaustion of strength, and bitterness of disappointment which result from misplaced effort to accomplish the impracticable. Perhaps, however, this wisdom comes rather from the good fortune of having a true philosophy than from mere strength of mind. Let us, then, be thankful that the Church has always instructed her children to accept the facts on both sides, not pushing them towards the extremities, but drawing them towards the centre, acknowledging the utter impossibility of thoroughly uniting them, and studying rather to observe these facts and deduce accurately the principles derivable from them, than to theorize brilliantly.

Manichæan boldness cut the Gordian knot by deciding that evil emanates from a hostile divinity, an Almighty Satan, who loves sin for its own sake and because it is abhorrent to Him whom he hates, the Good God. By making this world the battle-ground of two nearly equal powers, that extraordinary religion reduced the controversy before us to very insignificant dimensions. In recoiling from the abominable tenets of that sect into which he had been lured, Augustine would naturally labor to show the needlessness of the hypothesis of an adverse deity, and to explain the existence of evil in a world created by one sole and righteous God. In his attempt he would be exposed to the hazard of magnifying unduly the part which God is pleased to assume in governing the affairs of man, and seems to have actually gone the length of treating faith, the mental act by which man grasps the proffered salvation, as the result of God's grace working irresistibly upon the soul. Such teaching is very susceptible of gross perversion in the hands of the indolent, the worldly, and the profligate, who are glad enough to throw off the blame of their misdeeds and negligences upon Divine Providence. To how great an extent such pleas were used at Rome we cannot at this distance of time be certain, but may easily credit the assertion that Pelagius's indignation was kindled by what he heard of this kind against the wretches whose ingratitude towards their Father in Heaven permitted them to seek shelter behind such a miserable excuse, and also against the doctrine which countenanced such conduct. He vehemently insisted that the sinner commits his own sin, and has himself to blame for both it and its dire consequences.

However, the allied monks did not commence the real work of spreading their belief till after Alaric had marched his Gothic hordes into the streets of Rome and given the ancient city over to carnage, rapine, and plunder. In 410 they fled to Africa, where Celestius involved himself in trouble by seeking ordination at Carthage, being opposed by Paulinus, who, from having been a deacon at Milan, was probably to some extent acquainted with his peculiar ideas. He was accused of holding erroneous views concerning original sin, regeneration, and perfectibility, was tried before a synod which assembled at Carthage in 412, condemned, and excommunicated. An appeal which he made to the bishop of Rome being utterly disregarded, he shook from his feet the dust of Africa, and sought a more salubrious atmosphere among the mobile Orientals, making his home at Ephesus. Pelagius had preceded him in his eastward flight, and taken up his residence in Palestine, there encountering the famous Jerome, who from a friend soon became his bitter antagonist. But Pelagius did not thus easily elude ill-report, for he was forthwith opposed by a young presbyter from the country of Hosius, whom Augustine had recommended to Jerome of Stridon, that learned, voluminous, and vindictive writer, who so bitterly denounced Origenism, was the means of introducing Greek learning into the West, encouraged monkery, and strove to put down the new heresy that was being imported into a field already too thickly sown with them. Unfortunately, the delegate of Augustine and Jerome, who perhaps did not care to engage personally in the suit, this Orosius, did not understand Greek. John of Jerusalem and his synod therefore readily consented that the trial should be transferred to a court of more competent jurisdiction, that of Rome, prohibiting the heresiarch in the meantime from proclaiming his doctrines. Other accusers soon afterward appearing in the persons of two Gaulish bishops of doubtful reputation, Pelagius was summoned in the same year (415) before another synod, which was held by Eulogius, metropolitan of Cæsarea, at the town which had formerly been called by the familiar name of Lydda. On this occasion, owing to the absence of the complainants, Pelagius contrived to purge himself of the fault laid to his charge, and obtained an acquittal, which, however, was not of much intrinsic value, as being no more than an *ex parte* decision of an uninformed tribunal. For its leniency this council of Diospolis

(Lydda) received from Jerome the abusive epithet of "*Miserable synod.*"

Zosimus, bishop of Rome, now appears upon the scene, holding a synod at which the art of Celestius wins over the partial Greek to his side of the dispute, and then addressing a letter full of reproof and unwarrantable assumption to the African Church, commanding that the accusers should come to Rome within two months, or else that the charges should be dropped. Aurelius of Carthage, in nowise intimidated, held two numerously attended councils, and with the approbation of more than two hundred bishops, calmly replied in substance that the African Church was independent and entirely able to take care of her own affairs, without the assistance of her Romish sister, and that the two heretics, Pelagius and Celestius, must stand condemned until such time as they should retract their errors. Moreover, they thought fit to retort upon Zosimus that he, and not they, had been hasty and credulous in listening to the unsupported assertions of biased persons. Instead of flying into a stage passion and metaphorically tearing his hair in the fury and imbecility of his rage, Zosimus, influenced doubtless by the fact that the civil sword had been unsheathed against the two promulgators of false doctrine in an imperial rescript of Theodosius, turned completely around, condemned those men himself in very strong language, and not only adopted the decisions of the African synods, but required them to be signed by all who occupied the episcopal seat. As nineteen Italian bishops could not endure this test of orthodoxy, and were consequently deposed, it surprises us that they did not organize into a sect, especially as among their number was Julian of Eclanum, a man of ability and prominence sufficient to have marked him out as a leader. Fortunately, such was not the case, and after carrying on the controversy with the orthodox, whom they stigmatized as *Traducianists* and *Manichæans*, till the Council of Ephesus branded their opinions as heretical along with those of Nestorius, Pelagius and his party sink out of sight.

The nearest approach to the formation of a distinct sect was made by a monk who, emigrating from the East to France, established a monastery at Marseilles some time about 410 A. D. He held views similar to those of Pelagius, but less extreme, and succeeded in making them popular in Gaul, notwithstanding the well-directed opposition offered by Hilary of Arles and Prosper

of Aquitain, who also enlisted the efforts of Augustine on their side. The disciples of John Cassianus became very numerous in the course of a century, and were known as Massilians, from the city which was their headquarters, though they have since been appropriately styled Semipelagians. One of the most noted upholders of his opinions was Faustus, who was transferred from the abbacy of Lerins to the bishopric of Riez. So important was a work, written by him at the request of a synod of Arles, in confutation of certain high predestinarian views held by the Gallic Church, that another synod, of Lyons, requested him to continue it. His books were condemned not long after his decease by Pope Gelasius. Whether the vast majority of those who adhered to his teachings were Pelagians, in any sense, may well be doubted: striving to avoid the Scylla and Charybdis of Pelagianism and Predestinarianism, they probably overlooked the minor errors of John Cassianus, and mistook him for a genuine Catholic, as, indeed, he almost seems to have been. However, men of unusual penetration, like Cæsarius of Arles, discovered the lurking danger, and disclosed it to the imperiled flock. In 529, this metropolitan turned the tide permanently by effecting a condemnation of whatever was erroneous in the Semipelagian doctrines by a council held at Orange. Similar measures being taken by a council which sat at Valencia about the same date, and the joint decision being ratified by Pope Boniface II. almost immediately, the West had thoroughly committed itself to the disapproval of this mild type of Pelagianism, which, however it may have flourished in secret, thenceforth shunned the light of day.

To the self-contained and haughty-spirited Pelagianism no less commended itself, by the value and dignity it ascribed to man's own efforts, than the doctrine of Augustine, by throwing back the main responsibility for human actions upon the Creator, rendered itself acceptable to the dissolute and the idle. In recoiling from abject servitude, Pelagius leaped into a godless independence. In striving to shield men from opinions which remove all incentive to exertion, and leave them an easy prey to the demons of luxuriousness and sensual indulgence, he delivered them over, bound hand and foot, to the fiend of spiritual pride. If Augustine had obliterated *liberty*, was it necessary for him to wipe out *grace* from his scheme of doctrine? When that learned father forgot himself so far as to teach that in saving faith itself

exists nothing of man's own volition, would it not have been opposition of a sufficiently emphatic character to have answered that man does have *some share* in the formation within him of that virtue, without claiming that he has *all* the merit of its existence, God having nothing whatsoever to do with the matter? But the Briton did not stop short of the farthest extreme. He taught that in his natural state man possesses the power of choosing the good, and of persistently and successfully following it. Inasmuch as God made him, he owes to God originally the capacity of choice, and the power of execution: there, however, his indebtedness ceases, for, all persons being endowed with sufficient capabilities, they are then left very much to themselves, to survive or perish as they themselves choose. If the Holy Spirit of God has any influence upon the spiritual organism of the creature, His function is only to make the attainment of holiness easier: His office is not a necessary one at all, for the child of Adam is competent to break off from a long course of sinful indulgence, curb all his unruly passions, walk unscathed through the seven-times-heated furnace of temptations to which he has habitually yielded, and which are now sharpened by short abstinence, preserve unspotted henceforth his integrity and purity, and accomplish all this by the unaided might of his own determined purpose. Indeed, so complete is his power in these respects, that he can afford to dispense with all the outward means of spiritual improvement. He can walk uprightly from the inhaling of the first breath into his unaccustomed lungs, not so much as once striking his foot against hidden root or unsuspected stone. He has even lived in perfect righteousness without knowledge of revealed religion, guiding himself by the glimmer of reason's dim torch. It is to be seen that, according to this system, man saves himself by his own strong arm: he converts himself whenever it suits his convenience to do so, believes of his own motion entirely, and proceeds to perform good works by his own strength. The part allotted to God seems to have been little more than that of wiping out all his sins at his baptism, which sacrament was held to leave him *without sin*.

Augustine taught the contrary to all this, which must have seemed to him, as it does to us, grossly profane. According to him, man cannot repent, nor even wish to repent, until God puts the desire into his heart, which desire, once implanted, He care-

fully guards and cultivates through all stages of its growth, until it safely buds, blossoms, and bears fruit unto eternal life. Why, then, are not all men good? Because God does not plant, and water, and give the increase. But why does He not, since He is merciful, all-powerful, and incapable of fatigue? Because it has pleased Him to choose a particular few upon whom to bestow the priceless blessing of election to glory. Selecting a certain number, without regard to foreseen ability, or goodness, or anything save His *arbitrary* (may we be forgiven the term) pleasure, by a decree which antedates the foundation of the world, He accomplishes their rescue by instrumentalities which neither themselves, nor any adverse chance, nor the machinations of the Evil One can thwart. But why does not the All-merciful will the salvation of all His creatures? If He can deliver whomsoever He chooses from everlasting burnings, from the gnawings of the worm that does not die, from the foulness, and wretchedness, and degradation of a life of sin, is He not bound (we cannot avoid the language) to do so by every consideration of equity and compassion? The human heart can be trusted to give one only and unvarying response to such interrogation, unless it is steeled by the stern demands of a false consistency. What answer Augustine gave, drawn from the absolute right of a Creator over His creatures to do with them what He wishes, need not be dwelt upon here, for we may assure ourselves that it was never satisfactory even to him, but was employed as a mere make-shift in default of a better. His large heart shrank aghast from the horrible idea that the God of Love could have predestinated any to unutterable and inevitable woe, but did he not perceive that it is just as cruel to leave them to their destruction by simply refraining from interference, when a mere effort (so to speak) of the Eternal Mind would snatch them from ruin? If I see my neighbor floundering in the sea and neglect to toss him the end of a rope which lies coiled at my feet, am I much less his murderer than if my own hand had pushed him overboard? How can we justify God in this matter otherwise than by assuming the position that He *cannot* extend His hand to rescue the perishing? Is it asked, How can anything be impossible with God? We reply that inconsistencies are impossible, and that it is an utter inconsistency to talk of saving a *free moral being* in spite of himself. God certainly can sweep all men, good and bad, into heaven, but he cannot forcibly pluck them out of their own vile-

ness without destroying their identity and making them over again.

Against both of these schemes the protests of Reason are about equally strong. Its own instincts rise indignant against a theory which robs it of all power and independence, degrading it to an instrument which turns this way or that as the strings are pulled; while it feels at once the hollowness of a notion that makes man a little deity in himself, not self-created, it is true, but in the main self-sustained, self-controlled, scaling the skies with the ladder of his virtuous acts, and practically disregardful of a Creator who has retired from His self-moved universe, which He views in the serenity of placid contemplation, seldom rousing Himself to the effort of interposition. It refuses to be a slave, and knows that it ought not to desire the licentious freedom of a savage. What sanction it may seem to yield to either theory is wholly illusory, extorted from it by the pressure of violence, actual or threatened. Now, when two persons jointly labor to accomplish a given object, one need not be the slave of the other, even though such may be the ignorance and unskillfulness of the one that he cannot safely undertake the smallest particular of the work without specific instructions from the other. A willing man, who is ordinarily intelligent, could make himself very useful as an assistant to a mason or a carpenter, though wholly ignorant of the trade: in such a case the man is not a tool, nor is he able to labor independently. Does the incalculable superiority of Almighty God interpose an insuperable obstacle to coöperation between Him, in His infinite power and awful majesty, and man in his weakness and humbleness? If so, then man can no more invent a reaping-machine, or put that machine in operation, than he can perform a virtuous act; for either God helps man in what he does, or not; if God does sustain the natural life of the inventor, and the functional action of the brain, while he is taxing his resources to perfect his invention, then God assists him in the task,—unless, indeed, the man is an automaton, wound up by supernatural power to exert this particular effort of imaginary ingenuity. When we have allowed that God and man unite in doing whatever man does, we have certainly admitted the *possibility* of coöperation between the finite and the infinite, and removed the above-stated objection, unless there can be adduced some special reasons why a coöperation which extends through the whole kingdom of nature should be excluded from the kingdom

of grace. This hypothesis, so thoroughly satisfactory to reason, also readily explains all the texts of Scripture which bear upon the subject, the Bible always representing God's grace and man's free effort as necessary factors in the great result of salvation; not that no passages exist which ignore the one in order to give emphasis to the other factor, but that the texts of this sort on one side are balanced by equally emphatic ones on the other, and that the general scope of the Inspired Volume, and of each separate book therein contained, is to show that God saves His fallen creature, and yet that the creature must save himself. Is this a paradox? It is one of the commonest paradoxes of common life. The patient lies at the point of death, prostrated by the subtile and deadly influence of malaria, and delirious from the poison which typhoid fever sends through the system. Careful nursing and skillful medical treatment succeed in breaking the force of the disease and setting the sufferer upon the high-road to recovery. With the impatience of an untrained nature, the sick man yields to the cravings of an inordinate appetite, or rashly exposes himself to a current of air, and reaps the harvest he ought to have expected from his imprudence. Those whose fond eyes so sadly watch the fair promise of renewed health wither and perish, hardly need to be told that physician and patient must *work together*, in order that the hope of a complete and permanent recovery should be realized. The physician is God. God begins the work of healing the moment the diseased son of Adam is born into the world, and continues it to the end. As soon as the moral nature awakes to a sense of its own existence, the Great Physician begins to administer antidotes to the venom infused by the Old Serpent into our great progenitor, and from him transmitted by inheritance. He, unsuspectedly acting upon the hearts of pagan and unconverted Christian, draws them towards Himself; should they desire to repent, He causes them to realize vividly their own sinfulness; should they look up to the Crucified One with a single spark of gratitude and trust, He fans it into the flame of genuine Faith; and then, as they walk along the pathway of life, born anew into the Church and fed with the bread of Heaven, He assists every effort of theirs, warns against danger, incites to increased effort, arouses from lethargy, enlightens, guides, comforts, and protects them. Thus does God coöperate at every stage of growth in virtue and holiness; but it is only a *coöperation*, not at all a taking of the task out of the

man's own hands. If God originally moves towards virtue and piety, the sinner must voluntarily rise up and walk in that direction, and may not sit still waiting for the Divine energy to set him upon his feet, lest he should wait forever. Whatever may be the efficacy of the softening reägent applied to his stony heart by the Holy Spirit, Repentance and Faith are utterly impossible except as positive acts of the struggling, but resolute, will of a free man. Should the grace of God, when once fully admitted into the human soul, so thoroughly take possession of it as absolutely to control its motions, the life of the Christian would not be one of probation at all, but a mere process of quiet maturing. From the first sob to the last groan man is a fellow-worker with God in achieving the victory over sin, Satan, and death; capable of doing no good act without the assistance of Divine grace; but doing the acts himself, notwithstanding, not as a steam-engine rushes along, impelled by the hand at the levers, but as a being who can do or not do, resolve or forbear to resolve, love or hate, very much as he is pleased to prefer.

This we believe to be the doctrine which fulfills Vincent's rule of having been held always, everywhere, and by all as the Catholic Faith, and are also persuaded that its reasonableness is so great that the mere statement of it must prove convincing to any unpreoccupied mind. Semipelaganism hardly differed from it essentially except in the one particular of maintaining that it lies within the compass of mortal ability to come without being specifically called. It looked upon God as the Saviour of the willing, but also as the recipient of the eager and anxious, and sometimes as the rescuer of the unwilling; thus oscillating now towards Pelagianism and now towards Augustinism, instead of preserving the steady course of the true doctrine. It taught that the large majority of men are saved by the action of the Holy Spirit upon responsive hearts; but that in a few instances, forbearing to anticipate the prodigal's return by the outpouring of *preventing grace* which makes that return possible, he awaits, as it were, the sight of his approaching form; and in others actually breaks down the wanderer's opposition and conveys him forcibly into a position of safety. This and the Catholic doctrine being so similar in all points, perhaps, with the exception of that just mentioned, it is not very strange that they should have been mistaken for each other. Writers of church history seem to speak as though the Church in those days was

divided into three parties, Augustinians, Pelagians, and Semi-pelagians, whereas the fact is,—as may plainly be discerned in the narratives of those historians, if not in the accompanying discussions,—that Augustine, Pelagius, and John Cassianus drifted off in various directions from the vast mass of Christians, drawing a few followers after them, but leaving the remainder apparently undiminished, and not very greatly disturbed by their erratic movements.

It may be thought that somewhat more of ceremony should be shown in our treatment of the worthy bishop of Hippo, but, loyal and generally orthodox as that learned Father undoubtedly was, it may, with more justice still, be thought by others that the attempts so repeatedly made to explain away the extreme predestinarianism of his views have not been signally successful. However, the respect in which he is universally held demands that one great argument, which is almost always urged by his defenders, and really has force with a large class of minds, should be briefly touched upon. This is built upon Foreknowledge: if God knows beforehand everything that is to happen, the ground of the foreknowledge must be that He has decreed everything that shall occur; for if He has not ordained future events, how can He foretell them? As must be apparent, the whole rests upon the assumption that the All-wise foreknows all events that are to happen, without limitation. Is that a proper postulate? No one is likely to deny that God does foresee, ages previous to their date, the mighty revolutions which convulse our planet, and even minute events in the lives of individuals; but must we admit, without proof, that the Creator foreknows precisely how a moral agent will decide and act under any given circumstances? The Bible, we are confident, may be searched in vain, from cover to cover, for the assertion of any such thing. May not the divine power of foresight be like the human, only infinitely more perfect? With close observation of a fellow-creature's disposition and thorough acquaintance with the circumstances in which he is to be put, a shrewd man, conversant with the different phases of human life, can predict with some accuracy the course he will pursue. Penetrating into the inmost heart, as Jesus' eye read the secrets of those with whom He conversed in the days of His flesh, God can hardly be mistaken in any judgment He may form regarding His creature's action. Let us not positively affirm that the Divine Mind

cannot foreknow with certainty how every man will act under every circumstance of his career, but let us remember that no such belief is exacted of us. If any one's intellect finds great difficulty in conceiving it possible that we should be free to choose or reject, and yet that it should be known countless ages beforehand whether we will choose or whether we will reject, let him reflect that no obligation rests upon us to extend the divine prescience to such a length. We decline to permit any one to dogmatize so far as to assume such a premiss, and at the same time recollect that we ought not to dogmatize in the opposite direction ourselves. Nor is this theory advanced for any other purpose than to afford an escape to such as have been driven to Predestinationism by the difficulties which surround Freedom of Will. For ourselves we very much prefer to believe that, in some way to us incomprehensible, the All-seeing Eye reads each of us as an open page with infallible knowledge of our future. We see no sufficient objection against such a theory, no adequate reason why our freedom may not be absolute, and yet infinite Wisdom be able to foretell how that freedom will be exercised. I sit upon the sea-shore watching the slowly receding tide, hail a passing fisherman to ask how much longer the ebb will continue, and am told in reply that the flood will begin at such an hour. I have little doubt that the event will correspond with the prediction, but it never enters my mind to think that the one who gave the information has anything to do with the flowing of the waters. Does it make any difference that God's prophecies are absolutely reliable, that He created all things, gave laws to all things, and set all things in motion? Yes, a very great difference, if all things move only as they are moved; but if there exist aught which is self-moved, aught which is free to choose its own course, a morally free being, millions of responsible beings, then the case is very much the same as that supposed, and God may conceivably foreknow without forecordaining, foreknow what one man or all men will do, and yet leave him or them at liberty to do or not do as they see fit, sure that the event will not falsify the prophecy. We do not say with the irate Briton, "What is Augustine to me?" but we do take permission to weigh the opinions of even such a great and holy man. So glorious a name shall not blind us to errors which we suppose ourselves to have detected in his system, nor prevent us from pointing these out unreservedly to others.

Both Pelagians and Predestinarians, recognizing the indubitable truth that large numbers of people are sinful,—weak and erring, if not positively vicious,—sought to explain the natural and powerful tendency that exists in all towards disobedience, in such a way as not to unite with the Manichæans in impugning the goodness of the Creator. Thus the discussion was carried up to the primal man. Adam, according to Pelagius, was in no respect superior to his descendants, and was not even exempted from the common fate of mortals, being subject to death even before he sinned; while, in St. Augustine's theory, which as to this corresponded with the orthodox doctrine, our common father was far more perfect than we are, physically as well as morally, and, had he exerted the ability he possessed of abstaining from sin, would have been translated to Heaven and transformed into the excellence of glorified humanity without stooping to the painful and humiliating process of dying. Diverging thus markedly at their very sources, the two theories flow through channels which separate more widely the farther one descends them from the fountain-head. If Adam was no better than his children have been, then his sin is not the cause of theirs; but if the transgression of Adam was the fall from purity and righteousness of the forefather of our race, then his crime and its consequences must infect his offspring more or less. Pelagius maintained that there is no connection between Adam's sin and those of his descendants, except so far as that his conduct was a bad example, inviting the imitation of posterity: the followers of Augustine, if not that saint himself, held the theory of a mysterious transmission of the taint through all generations of men, and even went so far as to impute sinfulness to all on account of this inherited tendency. In attempting to form an opinion on this difficult subject, we may well commence with a study of the laws of inheritance in general, and may expect great help from the investigations made in quite modern times for the purpose of discovering and establishing these laws. We are in a better position to undertake such a task than men ever were before. The experiments of stock-breeders alone ought to be sufficient to satisfy any reasonable person that characteristics are not only transmitted from parents to their offspring, but intensified and rendered durable to such an extent as decidedly and permanently to modify the species, under certain circumstances and within certain limits. The attention that has been paid to

ethnology and kindred branches in late years, has discovered that men are scarcely less subject to these laws than the brute creation, a truth which common observation readily discerns in the different families resident in any given neighborhood, recognizing with facility the distinguishing features and mental peculiarities of each. If necessary, the criminal calendar may be put into requisition also, to show that crime runs in families, some families being notoriously thievish for three or four generations, others murderous, still others profligate, and all probably continuing to display these deplorable family traits until the race has died out. This view does not lack Scriptural corroboration,—as is sufficiently well-known,—but must not be pressed too far. Man inherits nothing more than a *tendency* to sin. If this inclination is irresistible, then the victim of it is not chargeable with the guilt of the offenses to which it leads, unless a sepoy shot from the English guns was responsible for the slaughter of the man against whom the powder hurled him. Distinctly let it be affirmed that if a man is born with an *unconquerable* appetite for liquor, we will say, he is no more responsible for becoming a drunkard than he would be were he seized, and bound, and the alcohol poured down his throat. The appetite may be immensely strong by hereditary predisposition, and the individual remain a responsible agent; but once the line is passed that renders the force of temptation insurmountable, the unfortunate being becomes *insane*, and of course not answerable for what he does. This is the first limitation. The second is that the disposition to commit sin must not be accounted sin. It is beyond measure astonishing that any one should ever have been found so unreasonable as to believe that an inherited tendency could be imputed against infant or adult as sin. Just as properly could we reproach a cripple for being born with a crooked leg, or rebuke those unfortunate children who are born with weak lungs, feeble eyes, or defective circulation, because they are not sounder. Here lies a wretched sufferer who has hardly known a comfortable hour since birth. One of your stern theorizers approaches the bedside and commences his diatribe: "You wicked, lost wretch! Why are you lying idle there with a whole world going to destruction? Why do you not go forth and bear your part manfully in the great struggle? What right have you to be indulging yourself in sickness and misery? You are very much to blame for being in such a helpless condition: it is

true that you cannot change it, that you came into it without so much as having given your consent, and that you would gladly be well; and it is true that the whole fault is chargeable upon the criminal weakness, or scarcely more pardonable ignorance, of your parents in marrying contrary to the laws of God and nature; but, however that may be, you are their child, and are responsible for their fault, your miserable plight is a token of God's anger at you, and if you do not repent and do better, you know what you have to expect." Who that heard such words in a sick-room would not be strongly tempted to seize the unfeeling brute, and eject him with tokens of righteous indignation that even his rhinoceros' hide would not shield him from? Let us beware of blaspheming God, and doing a serious injury to religion. Such argumentation is simple and unmitigated nonsense. All the theology in the world must be unable to convince a thoughtful man that a child can justly be held criminally accountable for inheriting a taint, tendency, or weakness; and any theology that makes the attempt puts the knife to its own throat. It is no wonder that intelligent men with hearts in their bosoms, and some sense of justice and reverence still left, become impatient of such a doctrine. *Original Sin*, therefore, is not sin at all, nor sinful, if by Original Sin we mean that proneness to evil which we inherit from our ancestors: it leads towards actual sin, it results in positive offenses; but in itself it is no more sinful than *infantine* hydrocephalus or consumption is sinful.

The existence of this universally-transmitted downward tendency in such strength, necessitated the advent of our Saviour. When it was asked why Christ came, Pelagius, not at all disputing the divinity of the Redeemer, was ready with an answer which fitted admirably into the remainder of the system, and declared that His mission was that of setting mankind an *example* which should counterbalance the bad one given by the first Adam. In opposing this tenet the orthodox affirmed that Jesus Christ was much more than a pattern; that He undid that which Adam had so unhappily done; that He neutralized in those who accepted Him as the Second Adam the tendency towards wrong; that He became to all such a new principle of life, and that the redemption accomplished by Him extended to the bodies as well as to the souls of men. Adam was the father of the human family. All born in that household are inheritors of that nature into which

his transgression infused such fatal weakness, and unless they avail themselves of supernatural aid, and strive vigorously against the deadly inclination, they must go on from bad to worse, and finally perish forever. While nothing can eradicate that tendency on this side of the grave, it is still conceivable that a contrary tendency might be implanted which should wage internecine war with it, grappling it in a lifelong embrace, and slowly but surely crushing it. At the same time, both tendencies may be in a great measure subject to the control of the human will, either being greatly assisted or impeded in its efforts according as the man's volition joins with it or battles against it. Moreover, the good principle might be supposed to lie dormant for many years after it has been implanted, awaiting an opportunity to shoot up from the soil. Then, too, the upward tendency might be handed on by spiritual inheritance, as the downward is by the natural. Such is precisely the catholic doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, which is in substance that Christ is the Spiritual Adam, who, assuming the nature which had been vitiated by the natural Adam, raised it to more than its pristine perfection, and imparts the benefit of the exaltation through the Holy Spirit's agency to all who are made in baptism the children of God, implanting in their spiritual natures at the time of that New Birth a Principle of Life which, if assisted by their own earnest efforts, the energizings of their *souls*,—or moral, as distinguished from spiritual, natures,—enters at once into close combat with the principle of death inherited through the first or natural birth, and gradually chokes and supplants it.

The Council of Ephesus condemned Pelagius and his doctrines, but did not sanction Predestinarianism. How it would have treated the peculiar views of St. Augustine, had they come before it, we cannot positively say. Let it, therefore, content us that the Church never has authoritatively pronounced upon the great topic of fore-ordination. The questions involved in that discussion are consequently not *de fide;* so that a Christian can hold to Calvinism, Arminianism, or even Semipelagianism, and not be liable to censure for heresy. Such latitude does the Church allow.

Lest the system which has been represented as the one held by the orthodox should by some be charged with having no doctrine of Election, it remains that a brief statement be subjoined

regarding the view generally entertained by the received divines of the Church. That God does predestinate some from all eternity to be His chosen people, is undeniable. What we deny is merely that He predestinates some to happiness and others to misery, or that He selects some for everlasting felicity and leaves others to an inevitable doom. The *Ideality* of such doctrines of Election as those held by Calvinists, Arminians, and Nationalists is utterly wrong. It is one thing to decree that a given individual shall be among the number of the finally saved, and a far different thing to ordain that he shall be environed with many and great facilities for working out his own salvation. God does give one person what appears to us an infinitely better chance of salvation than falls to the lot of another. One child, for instance, is reared by Christian parents, whose prayers shield, and whose diligent and wise care protects its inexperienced and tender years; while another is trained with equal assiduity in the arts of pocket-picking and house-breaking. Similarly the Omnipotent so orders it that one person is proffered all the privileges of the Holy Catholic Church, while another is left to grow up under influences that render him fiercely hostile to the Gospel. The one may not accept the advantages offered him, or else may neglect to improve them, and so may convert them into curses; and the other may overcome his disadvantages, and force his way out of darkness into the light of truth; so that such an election is not an election that puts a man under compulsion at all, but one that finds him able to obtain salvation, and leaves him capable of forfeiting it. The days were when Israel after the flesh were the chosen people, the "Elect," of Jehovah. They were not all good persons by any means, and yet all who had received the rite of circumcision were of the number of the "*Elect;*" God selecting them to perform the great work of preparing mankind for the Messiah, and to keep alive the knowledge and worship of Him upon the earth, and honoring them with many valuable spiritual and temporal blessings; but leaving them entirely free to obey Him or to disobey Him, to practice good or commit evil, to merit eternal punishment or obtain unending bliss, as they chose. Those days have in a sense gone by, for a *remnant* only acknowledged their Saviour when He came. To that *Remnant* has been added the vast multitude of the baptized, and these together now make up the *Elect.* From the thronging myriads of mankind, some nations, some

persons have been called into the fold of the Church, while others have been left to wander. From East and West and North and South they kneel, and have knelt, and will yet kneel, before the baptismal font, or stand beneath the canopy of heaven where stream or lake affords the cleansing element; and each, signed and sealed, and regenerated, from that moment may know himself an *elect* man, and one *effectually called*, but yet in danger of falling away, and sure to do so unless he exercise due vigilance.

CHAPTER XI.

THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON.

There were now to be seen arrayed against each other two powers which have usually been linked in close alliance. On the one side raged those vast communities of fanatical and often lawless separatists from society which abounded all over the East. These men had severed all the links which bound them to the great world except one: they had forgotten father and mother, brothers and sisters, not uncommonly wife and children; they had turned their backs on all ambitious desires, longings after luxurious enjoyment, cravings for wealth, pantings after noble activities; they had gone down alive into a self-dug grave; and yet they were held by one tie to the great, busy, bustling, struggling world, a tie which was made stronger by the very fact of its being the sole remaining bond. Whatever agitation of society threatened or disturbed this link, sent an electric thrill through the scattered thousands of cœnobites and anchorites. Nitrian plains and mountains, Syrian forests and deserts, the thronged streets of Constantinople and Alexandria, all shook as by some mystic force, and heard with alarm the premonitory shouts and whispers of marshaling hosts. In the present controversy that was at stake which touched every monkish heart at that tenderest of all spots, where the divine insensibly blends with the human in the deepest of all affections. Every recluse of Egypt or the East felt that the Nestorian contest pointed a fatal weapon at the religion of Christ, and was also sensible of a peculiar sting in any doctrine which detracted from the real or fictitious honor of the sole virgin whom he dared to remember. While the great body of the Church concerned itself about the *Theotokos* only because they did not wish to admit, or seem in the remotest particular to admit, that the Person born of the Virgin was a mere man, these others became almost wild in their excitement because Mary was, in their opinions, being dis-

honored by the rash patriarch of Constantinople and his adherents. Hence proceeded the powerful inducements which called out Dalmatius from his living sepulchre, and, along with him, another man destined to figure very largely in the strife, another abbot, Eutyches by name. This power, being that of combined self-devotion, high, enthusiastic love, and untrammeled energy, was one calculated to achieve tremendous results.

Although one in interest and feeling, this power yet lacked unity of organization. Against it came that wonderful system which was in later years to mould the monkish fraternities into its stanchest and most valuable adherents, personated in one of the most remarkable men of his age. When the dreaded Huns, repulsed from Gaul by the skill and bravery of Ætius and his Goths, and seeking to wipe away the disgrace which had covered their arms on the field of Chalons, broke like a torrent through the barriers of Italy and swept over that dismayed land, leaving Aquileia to mourn in ashes a prolonged and gallant resistance, and seizing the royal palace at Milan, Leo of Rome, in company with two other ambassadors of the trembling Valentinian III., entered as a suppliant the camp of the fierce barbarian, and won from him a treaty which turned his steps away from the Eternal City; and when, again, the fleets of those hordes which had overrun North Africa, discharged the troops of Genseric at the port of Ostia, Leo shrank not from the face of an Arian conqueror, but marched out of the gates at the head of an unarmed procession to meet the approaching soldiery, and entreat clemency for the helpless citizens. Brave, artful, and possessed of extraordinary talents, this bishop devoted his abilities to the aggrandizement of his see, advancing claims which had hardly found lodgment in the imaginations of his predecessors, and seemingly anticipating, as far as he was able, the bold schemes of Hildebrand. In a notable contest with Hilary of Arles, about the right of the patriarch to restore a bishop regularly deposed by his metropolitan, Leo I. manifested at once his ambitiousness and his capability, qualities which were also displayed with sufficient plainness in his conduct during the Eutychian controversy, about which we are now concerned. All authorities, however, are agreed in awarding to Leo a right to his historical title of Great, and in conceding to him the praise of unimpeachable orthodoxy. Certainly it is no slight credit to the Roman see that its testimony was borne so unwaveringly against

two opposite heresies; Celestine unhesitatingly condemning that of the two-fold personality, without following Cyril into seeming Eutychianism; and Leo opposing with even greater decision the error of the one nature, without reverting into Nestorianism.

The antagonism between these two powers was real enough, but fell far short of the bitterness which still marked the enmity of Egypt and the East, and was due, as of old, partly to the rivalry of those mighty emporiums, the cities of Constantine and of Alexander, and partly to the scholastic emulation between the disciples of Origen and of Diodorus. The reconciliation effected in Cyril's day had been only a partial one, and soon gave place to renewed strife of even greater malignity.

In the year 444 Alexandria was deprived of the talents, and delivered from the oppressions, of Cyril, and received in his stead a prelate who surpassed him in everything but ability, being even more violent and unscrupulous than he, but devoid of his dexterity in adapting his measures to the exigencies of the occasion, and chargeable with gross immoralities of the basest sort. This man, in order to extend his influence, indulged in the extremely objectionable practice of encouraging the disaffected in other jurisdictions, increasing greatly in this way the difficulties which always attend the administration of discipline, and fanning into a hot blaze what else would speedily have died out of itself, besides alienating from himself the affections of his brethren. Among those out of his own patriarchate who suffered from his machinations were three of considerable note, two of whom were suspected of leaning towards Nestorianism. Theodoret of Cyrus incurred his displeasure by adding his name to the list of signers to a circular letter issued by Proclus of Constantinople,—an act which was distorted into an acknowledgment of the supremacy of that patriarch over his own proper patriarch, the Syrian,—and was punished for that and for heresy by an anathema. Ibas of Edessa narrowly escaped a similar fate. But the full weight of Alexandrian anger descended upon Flavian of Constantinople, whose great offense was that he occupied a loftier throne than that which held Dioscorus.

Domnus of Antioch, at the instigation of Dioscorus, accused Eutyches, who was a presbyter as well as an abbot, to Flavian, but with no effect, as he himself lay under suspicion of Nestorianism. About one year subsequent, 448, another accuser appeared

on the scene in the person of the same Eusebius who had been prime mover in the attack upon Nestorius, and who appears to have been one of those far-seeing, self-sacrificing, brave spirits who, preferring the turmoil of a just and unavoidable war to the stagnation of indifference and the lethargy of moral death, valiantly lead forlorn hopes to the great disturbance of their own peace, and the no small damage of their reputations. He, now bishop of Dorylæum, denounced Eutyches to his patriarch, and had him summoned before the council which sat that year, much against the wishes of Flavian, whose prudence or timidity shrank from the fierce contest, which he too truly foreboded, with the factious partisans who were sure to throng to the support of the abbot. Eutyches was ready with a subterfuge: he had registered a mental vow not to leave his monastery. Unfortunately for him, it was remembered that he had already swerved from that resolution on one memorable occasion. He yielded so far at length as to put in an appearance, but came supported by a large train of monks and soldiers, and by an imperial commissioner; all which protection, however, did not avail to save him from being found guilty of lapsing into the errors of Valentinus and Apollinarius, nor from deposition and excommunication. Eutyches forthwith made informal appeals to the three remaining patriarchs, and had the satisfaction of being received into communion by the officious and intermeddling Dioscorus. Theodosius, having weakly and vainly tried to reconcile the patriarch and his deprived presbyter, yielding to the pressure brought to bear upon him by the Alexandrian faction through Chrysaphius, the reigning eunuch, called the council which the other side deprecated as wholly unnecessary. Ephesus and the same church of St. Mary, which eighteen years before had resounded to the acclamations of a general council, witnessed the assembling of that infamous body which Leo so forcibly characterized as a "Robber Synod." The second council of Ephesus, held in 449, was most irregularly constituted and conducted. In the first place, it was unscrupulously packed, many of those bishops who were thought to be unfavorable to Eutyches being excluded, on the ground that they were Nestorians, or on any other frivolous charges that could be trumped up against them, Theodoret being specially singled out by name for exclusion, unless the impossibility should occur that the unanimous wish of the assembly should desire his presence;

and, on the other hand, the Syrian abbot, Barsumas, being received as the equivalent of a bishop in behalf of the monkish faction. In the second place, the whole council was overawed, with the exception of those dauntless souls whom nothing could shake, by a vast concourse of unruly and ungoverned monks and parabolani, who attended upon the steps of Dioscorus and Barsumas. From beginning to end there seems to have been little else than riot and disorder. Cyril's successor apparently remembered the transactions of the former meeting, and had resolved to outrival his master. One of his shrewdest acts as president was to expel all reporters but those on his own side, thus obviating the danger of adverse accounts reaching the imperial ear. He contrived to evade the repeated efforts of the Roman delegates to secure a hearing for a letter which their patriarch had addressed to Flavian, it being too powerful an exposition of the true doctrine, in opposition to both Nestorius and Eutyches, to please one who had already determined for the council as to how it must decide. This letter having been received by the assembly, the exclusion of it was a wrong to them, as well as an insult to its author. The exculpation of Eutyches was, of course, a foregone conclusion, and so was the condemnation and deposition of Flavian, even though in effecting it recourse should be had to extreme duress. The two imperial commissioners who had been deputed to keep order, either had a most extraordinary conception of their duties, or were very incompetent officers. Instead of restraining the tendency to riot, the civil arm added to it a great accession of force. When the grand scene of terrorism was about to be enacted, the proconsul of Asia, obedient to the summons of Dioscorus, advanced into the hall, attended by his minions. A blank sheet of paper, intended to be filled out with a sentence of deposition upon Flavian, was displayed, and the bishops bidden to sign it. A few, probably, refused obedience. One of the Roman delegates, the deacon Hilary, showed becoming independence, and had difficulty in escaping through by-ways to Italy; Eusebius was imprisoned, but escaped; Theodoret, Ibas, and even Domnus were visited with conciliar censure; and as for Flavian, he was so terribly maltreated,—even to the extent of being kicked and stamped upon by Dioscorus and Barsumas, according to the charge of Eusebius of Dorylæum against them, as recorded by Evagrius,—that he died on a journey only a few days afterwards.

Eutychianism, like Nestorianism, was an attempt to explain the nature of the union between God and man in Jesus Christ. The latter started from the two natures, and argued that, inasmuch as the natures were separate and distinct, there must be personalities correspondent; while the former set out with the proposition that there is only one person, and proceeded to deduce thence a conclusion fully as unwarranted as that against which Cyril had contended so fiercely at the first council of Ephesus. Eutychianism was plainly a reaction from the doctrine of Nestorius, as that had been from the still earlier heresy of Apollinarius. When men vehemently oppose a particular opinion, they are apt to swing over to its opposite: so nothing was more natural than that, in an attempt to put down the error of two persons, they should insist so strongly upon the unity of individuality as to make it include a unity of nature also. Eutychianism was, in some respects, a return to the Apollinarian point of view: for Apollinarius had really fused the two natures into one by denying to our Lord a human spirit; but it differed in carrying the fusion much urther, or rather, in boldly acknowledging the commingling that had been only inferentially taught by the older system; and also in making the change take place after the union, both natures having been perfect and entire, the divine consubstantial with the Father, the human consubstantial with ordinary humanity, until the moment at which they were combined in the womb of the Virgin. With respect to this last point, difficulty surrounds the notion of the preëxistence of the consubstantial humanity, which tenet only escaped going over bodily to Nestorianism, and taking all with it, by being explained of abstract human nature,—whatever that may be.

We have already studied the necessity of a unipersonality in our Saviour, and are now to see the equal necessity of the continued separateness of the two natures. The belief in one nature builds itself chiefly upon the difficulty of imagining a union of the divine with the human without a fusion. The trouble is not in admitting the possibility that any two natures should preserve their distinctness though meeting in the same person, for that every man knows to be one of the mysteries of his own existence, feeling himself a duplex being, in whom reside the two unmingled natures of the animal and the spirit; but in conceiving the possibility of such union between natures as widely separated from each other

as the divine and the human. Every one must be sensible of the weight of this objection who does not view the question with the rapid and cursory glance of long acceptance, but calmly and steadily, as Plato would have gazed upon it had the mystery of the incarnation been revealed to him while investigating the problems of earth. How can a person be at once created and uncreate, passible and impassible, weak and all-mighty, mortal and immortal, confined in space and filling immensity with his presence, finite and infinite? This is the mystery, this the hard problem, this the almost insurmountable obstacle to faith. And, lo! it is proposed to solve and remove it by mixing the two natures! It is hard to believe that the same *person* hung in agony upon the cross and sat painless upon the eternal throne; but is it easier to credit, not that one person did thus in two distinct natures, but that one person in *one nature* felt at once and did not feel the sufferings of Calvary? Is it not by far easier to conceive the perfect distinctness of the two natures, than to see how the human could retain its existence at all when once a fusion commenced? Can the infinite be to a small degree finite, and not become altogether finite; or can almightiness partake of weakness, to however small a degree, without ceasing to be omnipotent? Another difficulty discloses itself when we turn our thoughts to the notion of personality, and wonder how a person already existent can endure the augmentation of a new nature. In our ideas the personality, eternally-existent, of God the Son, seems too thoroughly filled up to admit of the addition of a distinct, a continuously distinct, nature; whereas we can find analogies in the changeableness of which *we* are conscious to support the idea of such an addition, provided only the added nature be blended with the old and absorbed into it. Let us candidly admit the strength of both these objections, and in reply merely urge their insufficiency to discredit revelation; in order to accomplish which it would be requisite to adduce such evident inconsistency that logic would compel us to say, not simply, I cannot comprehend this, but explicitly, I cannot credit the possibility of this. Faith comes to our aid upon the failure of the Understanding, and enables the humble-minded to believe, *upon sufficient evidence*, whatever is not invincibly hostile to Reason.

Having already shown how any tenet which detracts in the slightest degree from the unbroken integrity of the two natures

undermines the doctrine of the Atonement in general, it is only necessary here to point out particularly how the commingling of them militates against the continuous exercise of the Mediatorial office. If the mediatorship was to be nothing more than a conjunction once for all, at one instant of time, of God and man, its function would have been discharged, even had a fusion of the two natures instantly taken place, at the moment that their junction occurred; but that would be a very inadequate and unworthy view, indeed, of the tremendous and glorious work which God the Son undertook in becoming man. His design was to effect a permanent union of the two natures in Himself as a living witness to all the universe that heaven and earth were reconciled. As angels or men should dwell in adoring contemplation upon the living Christ, they were to behold in His two unmixed natures, united in His one person, irrefragable proof of this amazing fact. Moreover, in order to act as intercessor for the sinner, the ascended Christ needs the undiminished glory and undimmed attributes of the Godhead in order to approach the Father, and the weakness and narrowness of the humanity in order to descend to the culprit's level; while, as the Judge of living and dead He will require, upborne upon the cloud-wrapped throne of awful whiteness, both the omniscience of perfect deity and the sensibilities and sympathies of unimpaired humanity. What assurance could we have that a mediator who was neither God nor man, but a fusion of the two, would either feel for us in our struggles and sufferings with the sympathetic heart of perfect manhood, or judge us correctly and infallibly with the omniscience of divinity? The Inspired Volume can hardly be expected to speak very explicitly on this point, any more than on the unipersonality. The Scriptural proof of the continuous and unbroken existence of the two distinct natures must be in a great measure inferential. Therefore, the question is just the one upon which we need the explicit declaration of some authority to which all are bound to defer. The "Robber Synod" gave an utterance thereupon which evoked no universal responsive echo, but rather elicited the muttered or outspoken condemnation and execration of a large majority of those who received a report of its proceedings. Agitation almost immediately began for the holding of another council, to undo the wretched work of the Latrocinium; but Theodosius turned a deaf ear to a request of that kind, which was made at Leo's urgent sup-

plication, by the emperor of the West; and would probably have delayed the downfall of Eutychianism for several years, had not an accident providentially removed him from earth.

A stumbling horse will break the neck of an emperor as readily as that of a groom; at least so the courtiers of Constantinople must have thought as they beheld the sacred person of Theodosius hurled from the saddle of his swift hunter into the river Lycus. Pulcheria, whose influence had lately been somewhat eclipsed by that of the eunuchs, signalized her accession to the throne by immediately executing the just punishment of death and confiscation of his enormous possessions upon the worthless Chrysaphius. For the first time in all history the empire submitted to female rule. Elevated by the unanimous voice of an attached people, experienced in directing affairs of state, familiar with the characters of all who could aspire to seats in her councils or to draw their jeweled swords at the head of her armies, and beloved by the admiring populace, Pulcheria might pardonably have forgotten the prejudices and calumnies to which such a high position exposed a woman; but with the wisdom that had marked her previous career, she determined to divide the honors and cares of the throne with a nominal husband, and so offered her hand and the purple to one altogether worthy of her choice. The venerable senator had practiced, through years of honorable public life, the austere lessons taught first by severe poverty among the hills of his native Thrace, and later in the arduous campaigns of Aspar and Ardaburius. The virtues which he had displayed in humbler stations did not desert him when the flattering preference of his sovereign raised him to her side, but justified the plaudits which the grateful Church showered upon an administration mild without weakness, just without severity, and honest without parsimony.

Theodosius the Younger had inclined strongly during the latter years of his reign towards the Eutychian or Alexandrian faction. In this partiality his sister had never sympathized with him, but she had been unable to make head against it and the influence of the corrupt favorite. Now that she was free to act her own pleasure, and had chosen for her colleague a worthy man whose theological and religious views and sentiments coïncided with her own, it was evident that the star of heterodoxy was about to set. Yet there were reasons which made it prudent for the sov-

ereigns to advance cautiously in their dealings with Dioscorus and his followers. They could not well afford to do aught which would tend to alienate from them a large portion of the inhabitants of an empire which already shook beneath the tramp of expected invaders. They could not hope that the storm which had already burst in such fury upon the whole Latin world, inundating Gaul, Spain, Italy, and North Africa with devastating swarms of Goths, Huns, and Vandals, would spare their own territories. Already Goth, Arab, Mogul, Tartar, Persian, and Turk seemed to lift in observation their crested heads all along the shore line of the Greek empire, some close at hand, others discerned, but not discriminated, by the far-seeing eye of prophetic fear. How, then, should the rulers venture to take any steps which would tend to weaken the allegiance of their own subjects? Here stands disclosed one of the greatest evils resulting from the unblessed conjunction of Church and State. See! Nisibis and Edessa already cower before the uplifted sword of the Persian: therefore, heretics must not be affronted by censure, lest the empire should be despoiled of her defenders! Even Pulcheria and Marcian, staunch to the core, hardly dare to authorize the meeting of a much-needed synod, and stand undecided. However, in the sanguine hope that the contending parties may be reconciled by a conference, and so the forces of the empire compacted rather than weakened, they yield to the solicitations of Leo so far as to convoke a General Council at Nice, in Bithynia, to be held in 451. The Roman bishop had strongly urged that the place of meeting should be appointed in Italy, but naturally could not bring the Eastern emperor to concede this. The memories of the First General Council still hovering about Nice would, it was imagined, pervade the atmosphere with a holy calm, sedative of the ungovernable passions which some were sure to bring even to a concourse of divines; but, as soon as the usual Alexandrian mob appeared in the thoroughfares of Nice, all such anticipations were speedily dissipated, and the air grew thick with the gathering storm. It was apparent that the only prospect of peace lay in the direction of imperial supervision, and so the six hundred and thirty prelates were transferred to Chalcedon, which lay so near the metropolis as to be almost a suburb, and therefore afforded opportunity for the throne to watch their proceedings with closer scrutiny than would have been possible where distance prevented

speedy communication. It is a melancholy confession to make, that a concourse of bishops needed the interposition of the secular magistrate to restrain them from using personal violence upon each other, but the disgrace of such an acknowledgment is somewhat tempered by the reflection that this deterioration of the episcopal character was due to the interference of the civil authority in various ecclesiastical matters, and especially in promoting ecclesiastics of no character, and in preventing the Church from dethroning many a prelate whom nothing but that support maintained in a seat which he disgraced.

The Church of St. Euphemia stands outside of the walls of Chalcedon, on an eminence overlooking the Bosporus and commanding a full view of the shipping, warehouses, towers, and spires of Constantinople, the distant picture being set in a beautiful foreground of verdant country and well-wooded slopes. In the midst of so striking and peaceful a scene, and within the sacred precincts of that noble structure, both of which are so glowingly described by Evagrius, assembled the members and attendants of the Fourth Council, which was destined to be one of the most remarkable in the annals of history. Besides those who rightly occupied seats in the assembly, there were present and taking a prominent part in the proceedings, nineteen of the highest officers of state. The excuse for their intrusion may have been partly that Dioscorus was to be tried for his conduct at the last council, and partly that the interests of the public demanded the restraining influence of their august presence; but whatever it was, we cannot repress a sigh because so bad a precedent was set at so great a gathering of dignitaries; not that the correctness or authoritativeness of the decrees were in any respect shaken by their interference, but that color was given for future encroachments and a stigma put upon the Church as unable to take care of her own affairs.

All the patriarchs were present with the exception of Leo, who had sent two bishops and a presbyter as his delegates. These three, with Anatolius of Constantinople, presided. The council was by far the largest as to the number of bishops that had yet been gathered, among those at least that are called œcumenical. The West, it is true, was in no condition to dispatch bishops to great distances from their homes, the ravages of the barbarians making the prospect of their prolonged absence one not to be

cheerfully borne by their flocks; nor probably would it have broken in upon its old custom of leaving questions of the faith to be decided by the Greeks, even had Genseric not been lord of Africa, nor Attila passing like a sirocco over the fairest portions of southern Europe. Africa appeared by two bishops only, and it is uncertain whether they were not self-delegated.

The prompt action of the Roman delegation prevented the patriarch of Alexandria from taking the seat which belonged to that see, they demanding that he should be brought before the bar of the house and not be permitted to sit as judge, and declaring that otherwise they must, in compliance with their instructions, withdraw from the deliberations. Dioscorus was accordingly, after some demur from the imperial commissioners and a brief discussion, instructed to place himself in the midst of the house, as a person under accusation. Eusebius of Dorylæum once more entered the lists in his accustomed character, presaging perhaps that the day had arrived which should behold the tables turned upon the party at whose hands he had endured so much two years previously. At the joint request of Dioscorus and Eusebius, the acts of the former council were passed in review before this assembly, the reading of them consuming the greater part of the day. Much excitement prevailed throughout the session, and burst forth in a wild uproar when the commissioners directed that Theodoret should be admitted, the Egyptians shouting out against him fiercely as "the master of Nestorius." Theodoret calmly entered the hall with the mild dignity which characterized him, and advanced to the seat allotted him as plaintiff. This blow fell upon the Alexandrians like a thunderbolt, though Dioscorus retained his presence of mind, and continued to watch the proceedings with unabated vigilance and occasionally check them with wonted sharpness. But his adherents gradually fell off, particularly Juvenalis of Jerusalem, who had coöperated with him on the former occasion. This patriarch, with the Palestinian bishops, moved imperceptibly away from the haughty prelate, and took up a position on the other side of the church. Others followed their example, till Dioscorus could only count thirteen supporters, four of his own clergy having gone over. The reading had struck shame and contrition into the deserters' hearts, reminding them of the artifices which had been employed, such as those which had shut out the letter of the Roman bishop to Flavian, and revealing

too plainly the malfeasance of Dioscorus and his party in falsifying the record, many passages of which were discovered to be arrant forgeries. It was seen to be only plain justice to restore the names of Flavian and Eusebius to their honorable places on the church's rolls, and to pronounce sentence of deposition upon Dioscorus, Juvenalis, and their assessors for having wickedly condemned innocent men. Eventually, however, all were pardoned as having acted under constraint, except the leader. That arrogant prelate was put under arrest to prevent his fleeing from Chalcedon, and, refusing to attend the further sittings of the council, was, after repeated summons, deprived and banished.

The case of Theodoret yet remained undecided. Although Rome had pronounced him orthodox, this deposed bishop was strongly suspected of still adhering to the old Antiochene heresy. When, during the eighth session, his case was separately examined, great difference of sentiment regarding him manifested itself. Courtesy, not to say justice, would seem to have required that he should be permitted to explain himself, and his voice not be drowned down by the outcries of the reverend fathers when he made the attempt to elucidate his belief. Finally the matter was settled by his distinctly condemning Nestorius and Nestorianism, the rejection of the term *Theotokos*, and the assertion of the double personality: this declaration satisfied the council, and procured him its voice in favor of his reïnstatement in his see. Ibas was also restored to the see of Edessa, and thus these two men were temporarily relieved from the ill report under which they had so patiently labored, not, however, long to continue undisturbed by the breath of calumny.

The Council itself would gladly have ended its toils when the wrongs done by the Robber-Synod had been righted. The emperor, on the other hand, desired that it should not adjourn before it had set forth a clear and full statement of doctrine in opposition to the heretical schools. While we should rejoice to see the secular power for once exerting its influence to bring about a measure which must be adjudged in its ultimate fruits beneficial to the Church, we must not forget to notice with commendation the manifest reluctance of the great assemblage to dogmatize. The same spirit had shown itself beforehand in the raising of objections against the calling of a council, on the ground that it was unnecessary, the faith being already sufficiently well established;

and after the sessions had begun, this repugnance held its own for some time against the senate's urgency. Instead of being eager to exhibit their learning and skill in erecting new platforms and devising additional formulæ, instead of deeming themselves competent to evolve out of their own intellects infallible dogmas for the guidance of mankind, instead of supposing that the grace of heavenly enlightenment was so thoroughly under their own control that they had it constantly at command, these men, deeply imbued with the unvarying sentiment of catholic antiquity, shrank in diffidence and humility from a function which they felt extremely perilous to the individual, as feeding his pride if unnecessarily exercised, and to the Church, as liable to contract her boundaries within narrower limits than her blessed Founder designed. It was only after considerable delay and much protestation that, at the fifth session, a declaration of faith was at last agreed upon and submitted to the emperor for his approval. This declaration explicitly pronounced against Eutychianism. Eutyches himself went further, it is supposed, than most of those who professed to believe in one nature were prepared to accompany him, and did not admit that the human nature of the Saviour, before its union with the divine, was consubstantial with ours, but taught that, like the celebrated image of the Ephesian Diana, it had descended from heaven. This heresy (which Eutyches himself *may* have held) the unanimous sentiment spontaneously reprobated; so that an expression to that effect, couched in the affirmation that Christ is "of two natures," would have met with small opposition, because it would have been understood to imply only that there were two natures before the conjunction took place. As many persons conceded this who yet denied that the two natures remained after that event, as Flavian had been deposed for attacking this last theory, and as Leo's famous "Tome" contained a similar assault, it was obviously requisite that the declaration of the Fourth Œcumenical Council should not stop short of Leo's and Flavian's assertion that Christ exists "*in* two natures," unless, indeed, it meant to retract its recent action in deposing Dioscorus, hopelessly offend the whole Latin Church, and surrender the doctrine of the Mediatorship. The necessity of definitely pronouncing in favor of the words "*in* two natures" was indeed so plain that opposition was finally obliged to retire before the face of a decree to that effect.

The discussions upon this question involved the much-mooted

point of Cyril's orthodoxy, he having frequently used language which looked towards the belief in one nature. In regard to this matter, it is to be remembered that persons unused to abstract thinking encounter no small difficulty in accurately distinguishing between the ideas of *nature* and *person*, and that the very best thinkers and most careful speakers and writers often use those words interchangeably. *Nature* has both a broader and a narrower significance; the narrower and more exact designating mere qualities and characteristics, and the higher and broader including the abstract something to which these belong. Above this second meaning is a less common one, which embraces not only the thing, but the person also: a usage which is figurative, but not wholly improper. Thus, when we say, *It is the nature of man to rebel against oppression*, we select a particular quality and call that his nature; but when we compare him with the brute, and say that his lower nature is similar to that of the horse or the anthropoid ape, we no longer dwell upon one feature, but have gathered up a number into a congeries, and conferred them all upon a something to which we give the name mentioned above, and of which we believe in the positive, or only in the ideal, existence, according as we are *realists* or *nominalists*. Should we rise another step, and say, *Human nature cried out against the wrong*, we may be employing the rhetorical figure called *metonymy*, but are certainly attributing a very decided personality to nature. The vulgar understanding does not easily separate the different natures of which the human being is composed, but is strongly disposed to look upon him as possessed of one compounded, but indissolvable, nature as much a unit as is his individuality. Strangely oblivious of the perpetual contest which rages in each between the higher inclinations and those that draw their inspiration from the animal, and bears continuous witness to the existence of two distinct natures no further fused than as the one has been contaminated by contact with the other, and debased by voluntary subjection to it, the multitude are hardly to be weaned from the notion of a single nature in man even by the power and beauty of their faith in the continued life of the one while the other has been extinguished by death. The two ideas being thus closely interwoven in the popular comprehension, it is evident that many may have been seeming Eutychians when they were really orthodox, and that, in arguments and exhortations directed against Nestorianism,

the most correct and profound thinkers, especially before the rise of the later heresy, might employ without blame language which, looked at from another standpoint, would lay its authors open to severe criticism.

Was it not, then, a great mistake, of which this council may be justly accused, to have forced upon the unlearned and simple-minded dogmas too abstruse for their limited capacities and meagre attainments, and thus to have needlessly expelled from the Church multitudes who would otherwise have been her loyal children to the end, and died in the full communion of saints? We may lament the loss to the Catholic Church of the Monophysite myriads who refused to accept the decrees of Chalcedon, as we must deplore the departure from her fold of those sectaries who won such brilliant victories for Christianity according to Nestorius; and we may without treason even venture to suggest that wiser measures might have been devised which would have retained millions within the sentry-lines of the true Israel; but we must not forget that the rise of such disturbances was predicted, and the definite reason stated to be in order that it might be made manifest who were true and staunch and who were not. As far as the Faith was concerned, the Church was under most awful responsibility to defend it from all innovation. What would have become of that Faith had the doctrine of a single nature prevailed, has already been sufficiently shown. The blame of the secession rests upon Eutyches, Dioscorus, and Constantine the Great; on Eutyches for teaching heresy, upon Dioscorus for supporting him with the arts of a politician and the violence of a highwayman; and upon the emperor for usurping prerogatives which ought not to have been his, and thus transmitting to his successors the power of troubling the Church. Shall we blame a parent for disturbing the peace of the household because he enforces discipline? It is the undutiful child, not the father, who is blamable for the necessary infliction of punishment. Simplicity of belief is eminently desirable, perhaps, but how can simplicity be maintained where the other party insists upon resorting to sophistry? Besides, what is so very abstruse, metaphysical, and difficult about the faith enunciated by Ephesus and Chalcedon? The proofs and arguments may be recondite and psychological enough, but common people were never asked to enter upon their examination. What is exacted from the populace is the belief that Christ, having always been perfect

God, of one substance with the Father, took upon Him the body and soul and spirit, not of any individual, prœxistent man, but of humanity at large, and thus became a perfect man, of one substance with John or Peter, uniting in his own individuality two natures, which retained all their characteristics of power or weakness, and remained as perfect and distinct in all particulars as they were before their union in His single personality. Is this doctrine, indeed, so far removed from ordinary life, so high-elevated above the plane of common cogitation, that a twelve-year-old child of average sense cannot be made to understand it? If the Egyptians, for example, still vociferated that Christ was in one nature, instead of adopting the formula of Leo's Tome, why did they maintain such resistance? Because party-spirit prohibited them from coïnciding with the Bithynians and Thracians, because pride forbade their receding from a position they had once taken, and because their contentiousness and stubbornness had incensed the Lord to such a degree that He had punished them with spiritual blindness, and allowed the truth to become obscured from their eyes.

The decree of faith gave emphatic utterance to the conservatism of the Church, for it went away back to the Creed of the three hundred and eighteen Fathers and reäffirmed it, loyally accepted the improved formula of the one hundred and fifty Fathers, and, having thus protested against innovation, came down to the more recent œcumenical synod, and confirmed its decision in favor of the term Theotokos, and lastly, adopted the celebrated letter to Flavian as a wise and able exposition of those points of doctrine which needed to be defended against both Nestorianism and Eutychianism, and as worthy of being lifted above the status of a mere bishop's circular letter, and stamped with the authoritative sanction of a general council. This decree having been approved by the emperor in a speech made on the occasion of his appearance, together with Pulcheria, at the sixth session, it was subscribed by the bishops, and eventually ratified by the Church at large, so becoming a fourth bulwark of the faith.

If Chalcedon was œcumenical, it is hard to escape the conclusion that Nicæa, Constantinople, and Ephesus were so too. The authoritativeness of those three great assemblies of Christian bishops was assumed through all its deliberations, as well as implied in its decree of faith. That Chalcedon was œcumenical, who can doubt? The gathering was large enough to embrace

sufficient learning, talent, and fidelity, if six hundred and thirty leading divines were not too few to secure those qualities; it was not sectional, for the West was represented by the delegates from Rome (three, four, or five in number, according to different authorities), who certainly exercised considerable influence over its deliberations, and was also permitted to speak very distinctly through the remarkable letter of the Latin patriarch; and its decrees were afterwards,—not, it is however true, without prolonged and bitter controversy,—accepted by Christendom. It is an advantage sometimes to be able to concentrate our attention upon a small field of history, very much as it is to the naturalist to direct his eye upon the extremely minute object that lies at the focus of his powerful magnifier. Such scrutiny may bring to sight imperfections that are not pleasant to contemplate; but it also discloses unsuspected and marvelous beauties, and affords that insight into the nature of things which is so grateful to the active intelligence. In Chalcedon, then, let those who are interested in the subject of a dogmatic faith be assured that they will find what will more than repay them for the labor of study. Had each council stood, as it were, alone, not alluding in any way to its predecessors, not only would such reticence have cast grave suspicion upon the correctness of our theory, but the work of searching for the proofs of its general acceptance by the Church would have spread itself over great space. We have Chalcedon to thank for simplifying the labor of investigation by narrowing it down in the way that has been pointed out. To the patient student, wearied and distracted with examining records and brooding over religious contests, how pleasant to arrive at a stage that invites him to rest and survey from an admirable outlook the ground over which he has plodded, and feel his glowing cheeks fanned by the renovating breeze! For one who has been putting a much-contested theory to the severest practicable tests, and has not yet succeeded in entirely satisfying himself that it endures them, what a relief to become suddenly conscious that his theory is, after all, really the one which lies deep in the minds of all competent judges! The devout explorer, who has been forcing his toilsome way through the numberless obstructions which time, unbelief, and error have strewn along the channel leading to Catholic Truth, arrives in his downward course upon the current of history at the Fourth Council, his bark being nearly ready to founder by reason of the

injuries done upon her hull, and lo! he discovers that the now-deserted water-way was once thronged with goodly vessels, and takes heart to hope that the pennants of many navies will again float upon its breezes. Who does not see that the whole heart of the Church was, in 451, filled with reverence for antiquity, and with respect for the decisions of such councils as were acknowledged to have been œcumenical? Divided as men might be upon points then under discussion, in these feelings they were a unit. Dioscorus and Theodoret, Marcian, Pulcheria, and Leo, monks, parabolani, soldiers, sailors, and common people, all were ready to raise an outcry, or lift the strong hand, against any one who should impugn Nice, Constantinople, or Ephesus. Knowing as well as *we* can the character of those assemblies, and scarcely yet recovered from the shock of the Latrocinium, they do not pour contempt upon the idea that such gatherings can speak with any authoritativeness; they do not ridicule them as meetings of garrulous old women, or as mobs of riotous and drunken pirates; nor do they proclaim with trumpet-cry the extraordinary theory that every boor is competent to fabricate his own theology, but with the homage of loyal hearts all bow before the ratified decrees of the three councils as being sanctioned by the very Spirit of truth.

In authoritatively delivering its witness to the full doctrine of the Hypostatical Union, Chalcedon put the last abutment to the great arch of the Incarnation, upon which rests the only bridge that leads the sinner back to his heavenly Father. At Nice, it had been declared that the Son of God is of the same essence or substance with His Father; and at Constantinople had been rescued from attack the integrity of His manhood. These two councils having thus prepared, if we may so speak without irreverence, the materials that were to be theoretically fabricated into the God-man, our adorable Redeemer, it remained to be determined whether the Divinity, consubstantial with that of the Father, and the humanity, consubstantial with ordinary humanity, were really united in Him, and if so, whether they were commingled, or were preserved distinct? At Ephesus, came up the first question, it being promptly decided in favor of a thorough personal union: so, there was left for Chalcedon only to protect the two natures, admitted to have been perfectly divine and perfectly human, respectively, before the conjunction, from being absorbed the one into the other, and so utterly lost, or fused into

a third somewhat not God, nor man, nor both. When the Fourth Council had signalized its sixth session by decreeing in favor of the continued and absolute distinctness of the two natures, nothing more was needed for the full determination of the manner in which the two *hypostases*, or natures, were joined. From the date of that decree, or, we will say, from the period when it was ratified by the common consent of the Church Catholic, the doctrine of the Hypostatical Union was one *de fide*. The Church cannot, it is true, compel men to believe what they are resolute in rejecting, but loyal to the Lord who died for her, she has done what she could, first, to shield His divinity from insult, and then to defend from outrage the glorious doctrine of the Atonement.

Chalcedon invites another reflection. What but the guidance of the Eternal Spirit could ever have made the needle point so true in the midst of so many disturbing causes? See the mutual relations of Nestorianism and Eutychianism. How natural it is to sweep around from the repelling error of two persons into the opposite error of one nature, or, if driven away from the latter, to circle around to the former! Yet the Church displays no such tendency. Hers is not the strength that merely suffices to repulse the foe, and itself suffers from the force of reäction, but that imperturbable might which hurls the assailant back and is scarcely sensible of effort. Calmly confident in the impregnability of the position in which her God has placed her, she moves not from it whether Arius or Apollinarius, Nestorius or Eutyches comes against her. She merely lifts a hand of warning and exclusion before the intruder, and undisturbed, unperplexed, and unintimidated passes a new watchword to her children, so that they may know how to distinguish each other from the erring progeny of heresy.

There was, however, much in the conduct of the Chalcedonian fathers that we could wish to have been otherwise. Especially, perhaps, were they deficient in the conciliatory spirit, forgetting in their zeal for orthodoxy to cultivate the grace of gentleness. Animosities were not allayed. The Alexandrians, in particular, returned to their homes chafing under a sense of defeat and burning to revenge themselves upon their ancient rivals. Dioscorus was an exile in Paphlagonia. His successor, Proterius, was a Catholic, but was opposed by a faction comprising perhaps the more numerous and influential section of his flock, awed at first by

the severity of Marcian, but ready to rise in insurrection at the earliest opportunity. Just as soon as the repressive force of the military arm was removed by the death of that emperor, Timothy Ælurus (the Cat) was installed by a mob, and Proterius murdered with circumstances of great savageness and indignity. The claws of this usurper were torn from their feline hold by an edict of the emperor Leo, and another Timothy (surnamed Salophaciolus) consecrated in his place. This fortunate choice secured fifteen years of quiet and prosperity to the troubled see, until the seizure of the imperial throne by Basiliscus, a Monophysite, brought back Ælurus from Cherson, whither he had been banished. Soon after the restoration of Zeno, whom Basiliscus had driven from his throne, the heretical Timothy died, and Peter Mongus was irregularly elevated in his place, only to be immediately deposed in order to make way for the return of Salophaciolus. John Talaia, who soon succeeded this Timothy, was ejected, for reasons of his own, by Zeno: whereupon he threw himself at the feet of the Roman patriarch. Peter the Hoarse (Mongus) pitched his voice to the key of deception, and was suffered to take possession of the episcopal staff. By accepting the Henoticon, this man gained the Catholics and alienated large numbers of his own adherents, who received the name of Acephali, or the Headless, from having lost their leader. These strifes continued to rend the Alexandrian church and sometimes to stain the pavements with human blood, until the horror reached the climax, as it is said, of flooding the gutters with the gore of two hundred thousand souls slain at the installation of Apollinarius.

Palestine was the seat of similar disturbances, Juvenalis, upon his return from the Council of Chalcedon, being shut out for two years from the see for which he had just obtained the grant of the patriarchal dignity, by a seditious monk, named Theodosius, whom he found in possession and sustained by the influence of Eudocia, the widow of Theodosius II. Antioch was also subject to agitations, one noted patriarch, the contemporary of Peter Mongus, being expelled and restored several times. This man also was named Peter, and was distinguished by an epithet which recalled the occupation he had followed while a monk, Fullo, or the Fuller. The entire Eastern Church, indeed, rocked from side to side beneath the gales which, from time to time, rushed down upon it.

Three incidents of the weary contest may be selected for

remark. In 457 the emperor Leo, desirous of reconciling the various parties, had recourse to an expedient which furnishes us with clear and incontrovertible proof that the decisions of Chalcedon were approved by the great mass of Christians in the communion of the Catholic Church. He sent to all the bishops in the various provinces, and to some of the most distinguished monks, a letter missive enjoining them to give their opinions in regard to the Council of Chalcedon and the claims of the usurping Timothy of Alexandria. We are told that the replies unanimously condemned Ælurus and approved the council. The qualification is added, however, that some Pamphylian bishops regretted that the assembly had thought it necessary to insist upon the definitions of the hypostatical union as terms of communion. We see, then, that in the sixth year after the holding of the Fourth Council, although a few doubted the wisdom of setting forth the decree of faith which it issued, all the bishops of the Greek empire, from the midst of their people, as it were, and surrounded by their presbyters and deacons, pronounced without hesitation in favor of the correctness of that decree; as did also the bishop of Rome. The only method of destroying the conclusiveness of this proof would seem to be that of showing that some of the responses were given under coërcion. Under all the circumstances, it is not easy to count Egypt on the side of the council, the opposition to it there continuing all along so incessant and so violent, that great suspicion must attend any momentary departure from such a course of antagonism. But let those who require absolute unanimity for the sanctioning of a conciliar decree, concern themselves about this matter. As for ourselves, having adopted a theory which is ready to content itself with a marked preponderance of testimony in favor of the decree, we may drop a tear over the ecclesiastical grave of Alexandrian orthodoxy, but are in no mood to weep as though we had buried the Catholic Faith along with it.

When the cowardice of the abandoned Zeno hurried him away into the fastnesses of mountainous Isauria, Basiliscus made his brief usurpation memorable in ecclesiastical annals, by presuming to issue a circular letter virtually pronouncing upon questions of the faith. This commanded all who received it to attach their signatures to the document in token that they condemned the council of Chalcedon, and, announcing severe penalties against all

who should neglect to obey, obtained the sanction of so many names that we are compelled to blush for the episcopate of the epoch. The subsequent act of the same weak prince in issuing a counter-circular, as soon as rumor threatened his throne and life, might have warned a more prudent monarch than Zeno to refrain from following a precedent which had so doubtful an origin; but he chose to imitate the example rather than heed the admonition, and accordingly sent out a letter which was intended to effect a compromise between the contending parties, and was thence called a *Henoticon*. The substance of it was that the faith of Chalcedon should be accepted, but the council itself ignored, the supposition on which it proceeded being that the virulent opposition was pointed, not at the decree of faith, but at the synod itself on account of other measures which had received its sanction. This idea, doubtless, was in a measure correct, and very likely it was further true that multitudes of those who called themselves Monophysites were so only in name, being thoroughly catholic at heart; but definitions of doctrine cannot be lightly tossed away because some who object to them are well-meaning persons led away by strong prejudices, nor can the authority of a solemn council be given up on a similar pretext. At first the new movement promised well. Peter Mongus signed it and was confirmed in the see of Alexandria, and Peter Fullo of Antioch also consented to it; both of whom had been pronounced Eutychians, and probably remained so. This was in the year 482. Acacius of Constantinople at once admitted Mongus into communion, and thereby drew down upon himself the just indignation of the Roman patriarch, who had the double motive for interfering that John Talaia, the expelled bishop of Alexandria, was personally pressing his suit upon him, and that the Constantinopolitan had thus not only rejected the council of Chalcedon, but to some extent, as he was likely to think, treated with indignity the Tome of Leo. Possibly emboldened by the victories which had established the barbarian, Odoacer, upon the throne of Italy, Felix III. and a Roman synod deposed Acacius, excommunicated him, and wrote accordingly to the Eastern emperor. As the patriarch replied by removing the name of Felix from the diptychs, the result of the attempt at reconciliation was that the Henoticon created a schism between the two great sections of the church, which lasted from 484 to 519.

It is not to be imagined that Eutychianism had really conquered at Constantinople, a consummation that was precluded by the ancient rivalry of the Bosporus and the Nile, if by nothing else. Felix had a strong party there, particularly among the monks. Some of the successors of Acacius were themselves inclined that way. At last Justin came into power, supported by two ministers who were warm friends to Chalcedon, Vitalian and the future emperor Justinian. The breach was thereupon healed at the instigation of the populace, who demanded from John, the new prelate, upon occasion of his first public appearance, the recognition of Chalcedon, the condemnation of Eutyches, Eutychians, and Eutychianism, root and branch, and a return to fellowship with old Rome. Upon the Roman patriarch Hormisdas's receding a little from his primary demands, the broken harmony was restored, and the Henoticon vanished from the scene.

The Eutychians after the council of Chalcedon were generally called by the name of Monophysites, inasmuch as they had disowned to a great extent the heresiarch from whom they drew their being. In course of time they were divided up into a number of different sects, some of them distinguished by very shadowy lines of separation. One of the most famous disputed about the corruptibility of our Saviour's body, claiming that it was naturally exempt from the weaknesses of ordinary flesh and submitted to them voluntarily. The energy and wisdom of a great mind are needed to organize victory for a sect as well as for a people. Such a leader was given the Monophysites in the person of Jacob Baradæus, a Syrian monk, who, after traveling with amazing zeal and perseverance over vast regions, died in 578 at Edessa, leaving behind him, for an enduring monument, well-established and flourishing churches of the sect in Syria, Mesopotamia, Armenia, Egypt, Nubia, Abyssinia, and other countries, and having so thoroughly stamped his impress upon the denomination that it has since become known by the name of *Jacobites*. Although the missionary enterprises of the Jacobites never vied with those of the Nestorians in point of universality and success, they were far from being discreditable. Armenia, the scene on which appeared the disciples of Julian of Halicarnassus, soon after he had given birth to the heresy of the Incorruptibilists, and Abyssinia, whither Alexandrian Monophysitism early penetrated, became distinguished as strongholds of the sect. In later times, while the numbers of the

Jacobites have dwindled into comparative insignificance, while their influence has decreased almost to the point of extinction, and their Christianity become scarcely preferable in respect of morality to the paganism or Mahommedanism by which they are surrounded, they still raise in the East the banner of opposition to Chalcedon and profess a belief in the one nature of Christ.

CHAPTER XII.

THE SECOND COUNCIL OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

The four general councils of which we have been treating, having each pronounced upon one or more cardinal doctrines, together presented to the world a well-rounded system of faith, and one so complete as seemingly to leave little of vital importance to be determined by any future assembly. The dogmas concerning the Consubstantiality and the Hypostatical Union had displayed the truth respecting the Incarnation in so clear a light to the inquiring and reverential mind, that no one need any longer be in doubt as to what he ought to believe in regard to God the Son, or as to the propriety of worshiping Him: let skeptics advance what arguments they chose, these dogmas opposed to them an impregnable barrier. When the reconciliation with Hormisdas effected by John and his successor, Epiphanius, closed the schism between Rome and Constantinople, and affixed the seal of general ratification to the resolutions of the six hundred and thirty fathers, then it had been clearly defined by the highest authority that there exist in Christ two natures, one consubstantial in the strictest sense with that of God the Father, the other consubstantial in a less proper sense with that of ordinary humanity; the one perfect God, the other perfect man, with all the parts, body, soul, and spirit, which belong to humanity; and these two natures, remaining utterly distinct and separate after the conjunction, without either absorption or fusion, the divine still perfectly divine, and the human still perfectly human, the former not being deprived by the union of a single divine attribute in the most infinitesimal degree, nor the latter endowed with the smallest imaginable portion of a superhuman quality; and yet united, not by affinity, nor alliance, nor courtesy, but by the one inseverable bond of individuality, which constituted a single person at once finite and infinite, weak and almighty, limited in knowledge and omniscient, eternal and

born in time, incapable of feeling pain and susceptible of the keenest torture, Lord of life and mortal; which enabled the all-glorious Son of the Most High to shed His blood for the sinful race of Adam, and then to stand their triumphant advocate before the Father; and will fit Him to come in the clouds of heaven as the judge of the world, awful, compassionate, and infallible. Surely, it seems as though controversy might have stopped at this point. Heretics could scarcely hope to surprise the Church any longer, for what could they suggest that was erroneous concerning the Son of Man which had not been already fully answered? Should they, indeed, pretend to have found a weak place in the defenses, Zion might, one would think, smile without danger at the emptiness of their boasting, and rely in perfect confidence upon the strength of her walls. Other doctrines would, perhaps, be threatened, but that of the Incarnation must have been secure in the impregnable position it occupied behind the entrenchments of the four Councils. These had advanced with such regular progress towards the perfecting of the Faith, and had evolved so thorough a dogmatic statement of the truths regarding our blessed Saviour, that the grateful heart spontaneously bows in adoration of the Lord, whose providence so kindly provided for the necessities of later generations in giving His Church at that early age so complete a system of formulated doctrine.

As soon as we turn from Chalcedon to the study of the Fifth Council, we lose the interest which springs from the source just mentioned. We must not forget, however, that the General Councils did not have as their sole aim the settling of the Faith for unborn generations, but were even more necessary for their own age than for ours. They were necessitated by the urgency of the immediate occasion, and, while technically useless, may have been of the very highest practical benefit. For example, though, after the continuous integrity of the two natures has been settled, it may seem ridiculous for any one who admits the correctness of that decision to insist that the human will, the most essential attribute of a free agent, was absorbed in the divine, yet a due regard for the souls of the uneducated and of the unstable may require that a novel teaching of that kind should be specifically denounced. Therefore we may not rashly pronounce the remaining councils unnecessary, but ought to suspend our judgments until all the circumstances of the case have passed in review. As regards our-

selves, too, let us remember that our convictions do not always servilely attend upon the steps of logic. Perhaps, while satisfied in our understandings by the action of the first four general councils, we will experience, as we thread the mazes that still remain, and take a rapid survey of the strong redoubts constructed by the Second and Third Councils of Constantinople, a marked increase of confidence, a certain strengthening of our convictions. If such good results accrue even to us from the confirmation of what had been already decided, let us not despise these two synods as having been superfluous.

Nearly a century elapsed before the first movement was made towards the calling of a fifth council. Councils had come to be looked upon as dangerous things, as more likely to widen a breach than to close it; this was a harsh and a mistaken view to take of them, but yet one to which the conduct of assembled dignitaries had often given too much color. Even after Justinian had begun to entertain the thought of once more evoking the voice of the Church, he shrank from the hazard of convening an assembly, and preferred to adopt the plan, which had already been tried, of obtaining the aggregate sentiment of the episcopate by a collation of private opinions given in reply to a circular letter. Such a measure might have been pardonable, had it been honorably carried out, as an honest substitute for the more regular method; but when it involved bribery and intimidation, it was inexcusable. Are deliberative assemblies useless, in the Church or elsewhere? Can public affairs be just as well administered by a hundred legislators who stay at home and correspond with each other, as by those same men duly met together and consulting with one another in open session, or, if the case demands it, in secret conclave? Shall not men who are under solemn obligations to search for the very best means of extricating a nation from between the horns of an unpleasant dilemma, be encouraged to debate the subject, even at the risk of acting upon each other occasionally like flint and steel? What despot, hampered by an elective chamber, would not hail with loud acclamation the theory that he may neglect to call the delegates together, and may consult them by letters? An end there is at once to all outspokenness and independence. The ruler's imagination easily calls up the numberless resources which power can bring to bear upon isolated individuality. Say, for instance, that a particular member proves refractory, and dis-

plays a courage that does not blench. Why! How simple will be the task of representing to him that every one else has consented with complacence, and that he alone stands out, to approach him with this or that insidious temptation that may be supposed best adapted to shake his inflexibility, to whisper threat upon threat that might well chill the blood of the boldest! In a great gathering, on the other hand, the weak see that they are supported, the most mercenary that they are watched, the courageous that their fortitude inspires others; while the acute intellects discern difficulties, reasons, and devices which the dull would overlook a thousand times, and the powerful speakers eloquently and persuasively address ears that would be impervious to all unspoken language. The tyrant trembles when the popular assembly meets in his capital, and anxiously awaits the chance of proroguing it: so shakes heresy with the palsy of fear when a multitude of Christian fathers sits in solemn conclave, and would hug itself in an ecstasy of self-congratulation could it dismiss them to their homes to fall an easy prey, each man separately, to its machinations.

The controversy to decide which the council was summoned is said to have been excited, not by a man who honestly believed in the error attacked, but by one who wished to draw off attention from himself and his friends, so that they might be permitted to pursue, without molestation or annoyance, their chosen path, even if it led them away from the truth and from safety. Although indigenous to Egypt, the ideas which Origen had so ably defended made their way into Asia, and struck deep root in various districts, and among others in Palestine. While the early Church had not discountenanced the high allegorical or extreme mystical method of interpreting Scripture, which neglected the letter of the text and sought for all sorts of recondite meanings supposed to lurk beneath the exterior, it had been disposed to frown upon some of the results which the mighty brain of that strange being educed through the method he had improved, at least, if not invented. Prominent among these was a tenet which has always sounded very sweetly in the ear of the godless, and has extended its sway over many a pious, but weak, heart that has recoiled from the horror of the blazing pit, and sought to deliver even the worst from that dreadful doom. Origen ventured to advocate the idea that punishment is only temporary, and is always inflicted

with a view to the purgation and reformation of the offender. Embracing the strange notion that the hardened criminal, who has converted into curses all the mercies which the All-merciful scattered along his earthly path with such lavish hand, can be reclaimed by the stings of remorse,—that one who has been obstinately deaf to the pleadings of the Holy Spirit of God is likely to be lured into righteousness by the horrible execrations and detestable ribaldry of the damned,—the Adamantine skillfully emasculated the vigorous threats and warnings of the written word in order to teach the final restoration to happiness both of lost souls and of the rebel angels. Origenism, over which Jerome and Rufinus had, in the latter years of the fourth century, thrust and parried with almost equal skill and determination through many tedious volumes, survived at the beginning of the sixth; nor had time stolen the charms which enabled it to command the homage of devoted champions. In Palestine it had won, about the year 520, the enthusiastic support of the monastic society called the New Laura. As the other monks were generally pronounced anti-Origenists, we might anticipate that violent disturbances would spread among the *lauras*, or communities of monks, leading sometimes to bloodshed. The patriarch Peter, powerless to allay the commotion, brought the matter before the emperor, who was glad enough to have the opportunity of exhibiting his knowledge of theological subjects, and his art in adjusting controversies of that description. It is said that Justinian, in a letter to Mennas, patriarch of Constantinople, made the ludicrous mistake of charging Origen with plagiarism from a man who flourished later than the great Alexandrian, and gave his name to the Manichæans. At Justinian's suggestion, fifteen anathemas were pronounced by a Constantinopolitan synod against the teachings of the Adamantine. There were, at this time, two staunch Origenists at court, whose principles, however, were not so strict as to forbid their temporizing, or even committing a crime very near akin to perjury, in order to gain their ends. Theodore Ascidas and Domitian, two Palestinian abbots, lately promoted to bishopries, but usually residing in the imperial city, possessed great influence over Justinian. By signing the anathemas, they not only consulted their own temporal welfare, but placed themselves in a position to advance the interests of their party. While casting about for the most feasible plan of diverting the public gaze from his own

faction, Theodore's shrewdness and his hatred for the Nestorians combined to suggest the expediency of raising another outcry against that sect. No better artifice could have been contrived. The old opposition to Chalcedon still smouldered, alarming Christendom now and again with flames which shot upwards from the slumbering crater and reddened the whole heavens; and an earnest and laudable desire to regain the Acephali of Alexandria reigned in the royal bosom. It would not have answered to assail the Council directly, but the course was open of suggesting that the animosity against it arose from its having seemed to countenance Nestorianism by admitting into communion men who were suspected of favoring that heresy. In selecting those three Antiochene doctors,—Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrus, and Ibas of Edessa,—for condemnation, Ascidas was true to the traditions of the Egyptian school, and also reëchoed a cry which had long resounded through the churches. They were not, however, all upon an equal footing, for the orthodoxy of the last two had been recognized at Chalcedon, which circumstance effectually protected them from the anathemas of all who did not wish to appear in the field against that council; while no such shield covered the venerable and unprotected head of Theodore. The latter, therefore, might be personally anathematized without injury to the memory of Chalcedon, but the persons of the other two were sacred from attack. The only scheme for reaching them would be to affix a stigma to their writings. Some of those were accordingly selected which had been written before they had abjured their errors, certain compositions of Theodoret directed against Cyril, and a letter of Ibas to a Persian named Maris. The artifice of Ascidas succeeded so well, that when, in 544, Justinian published an edict in which he had collected into *Three Chapters* (as they were called) the writings of Theodore, Theoderet, and Ibas, and pronounced anathemas upon them and their defenders, and upon Theodore of Mopsuestia himself, Origenism vanished from sight like a taper before the blaze of a conflagration.

The antipathy to these men was strangely persistent, they not having been founders, nor very prominent leaders of the sect, and one of them, indeed, having died the very year that Anastasius first attacked the Theotokos. Two of them had publicly renounced their errors, but mankind is usually very reluctant to believe in the sincerity of the repentance of those who have once

incurred its displeasure. Though unable to deny that Theodoret did hold at one period of his life sentiments not strictly orthodox, we cannot refrain from paying a tribute to the almost unexampled moderation of his conduct. In an age of fierce strife, when the very best were being drawn into unseemly contentions, and goaded into rash, unjust, and violent deeds in behalf of a faction, this man appears to have preserved a calm and collected demeanor, even in the midst of a tumultuous assembly that was almost on the point of laying hands upon him, and to have placed such restraint upon his own unruly passions as to acknowledge his errors upon being convinced that the Catholic Church, and not he, was in the right. Theodoret's recantation may have been the result of cowardice, or the work of self-interest: if so, it was a most disgraceful act. Such a supposition, however, gains no color from the previous conduct of the bishop, nor is it borne out by anything we can trace in his after life: on the contrary, all the evidence seems to favor the view that it was the honest deed of a frank, courageous, humble soul, turning away in self-abasement from its errors, and anxious to atone for the evil of its previous example by making open confession. Thus viewed, the conduct of the execrated bishop at Chalcedon, when his voice was lost amid the angry cries of his auditors, becomes grand in the extreme; while the man himself rises into a hero. He is not driven into flight and revolt, he does not suffer himself to be thrown off his balance, but lifts his hoary head far above his enemies in placid majesty, and quietly bides his time, unshaken in resolution, unfaltering in humility, and undaunted in spirit.

As Justinian is to play so active a part in the new controversy, his life and character may well engage our attention, in order that we may know with what kind of a man the Church then had to deal. The first of his obscure Dacian family to wear the purple was an uncle who, having deserted Sardica on foot with two companions, and been enrolled among the huge and mighty guardsmen of Leo, fought his way upwards till, at the death of the emperor Anastasius, he had become their commander, and was in a position to aspire to the throne. Ashamed of the ignorance by which he felt himself fettered, Justin resolved that his nephew and successor should enjoy the advantages of a thorough education. Like Theodosius II., Justinian was a close student, but not endowed by nature with any remarkable degree of talent. For-

tunate in such generals as Narses and Belisarius, and such a lawyer as Tribonian, his reign was made illustrious by many brilliant victories, and by those marvels of jurisprudence, the Code, the Pandects, and the Institutes; but the monarch himself fails to excite our admiration. His private life was a strange medley of ascetic rigor and licentious indulgence, and his public administration disgraced by frequent manifestations of cruelty and rapaciousness. The treatment awarded that pillar of his throne, the magnanimous and invincible Belisarius, after age had weakened the dreaded arm of that hero, needed not the assistance of Procopius's satire to consign Justinian's memory to the well-merited reproach of posterity. Perhaps no sovereign ever made worse selection of a consort than he did in offering his hand to the infamous prostitute, whose elevation made the name of Theodora more detested among the virtuous than even that of Antonina, Belisarius's shameless spouse. The emperor and empress arrayed themselves in opposing ranks upon the all-engrossing subject of religion, Justinian being a decided Catholic, until in extreme old age he turned aside into the forbidden paths of Incorruptibilism, and Theodora, on the contrary, never swerving from her allegiance to the Monophysite party. Some suppose that motives of state induced the pair to become ostensible patrons of the two parties, and profess to discover proof of this in the fact that in general the wifely influence of the empress was unbounded.

The edict of 544 commanded generally obedience, obtaining the signatures of a large number of Eastern bishops, though not a few of them displayed much reluctance to endorse its sentiments. Some declined to subscribe, and cheerfully submitted to banishment. The four patriarchs overcame their repugnance with great difficulty, and Mennas covered his retreat with the extraordinary stipulation that he should be free to erase his signature in the event of the Roman bishops not concurring. From two quarters, however, arose a more determined opposition.

More than a century previous the craft of Ætius had stung the general of Africa to revolt against his ungrateful sovereign and open negotiations with Gonderic, the Vandal king, who was then engaged in the task of subduing Spain. The forces of those barbarians under the redoubtable leadership of Genseric, who had succeeded to his *half-brother*, easily overthrew the troops which Boniface, too late repentant, could marshal against them, and

soon overran North Africa. Then dawned a dark day for the church of Cyprian and Augustine. The tyrant was a bitter Arian, and taught his race to wield the biting scourge of persecution with merciless fanaticism. The faith of Athanasius and the Councils was proscribed. The fathers of the Church were insulted, banished, tortured, slain. To the horrors which avarice, licentiousness, and cruelty perpetrate under cover of war were added the still greater sufferings inflicted by religious hatred. We feel our breasts heave with pity for the down-trodden people and oppressed church. Yet mark the end! Genseric's Vandals amass plunder and live in luxury upon the labor and wealth of others; and in three generations have become so enervated that the once invincible hordes are dispersed by the onset of Belisarius like the mists of morning before the rising wind. On the other hand, the persecuted Church has clothed herself, during those generations, in clean and shining robes, washed and anointed herself, and resumed the glorious beauty of an earlier period. Scant fare and a life of hardship and exposure under the blue canopy of heaven and amid the healthful breezes that swept over plain and mountain, have restored the delicate outline and radiant purity which had fled from a countenance swollen with the surfeits of indolence and gluttony. In the midst of peril and privation, the African church had learned to be loyal, courageous, and firm, so that when Justinian bade her swerve aside from what she believed to be the path of rectitude, many of her sons rose in their might and claimed the privilege of serving God rather than man. Some, doubtless, had practiced the disgraceful art of turning their coats, according as this sect or that happened to be in the ascendant, till they had come to wear any badge with placid servility, and were ready now to denounce the Three Chapters in unmeasured terms; but there were not wanting many prepared to stand shoulder to shoulder with Pontianus in resisting imperial usurpation, and let the despot of Asia know that the freedmen of Christ were slaves of no man, whatever his power and however vast his pretensions.

Resistance also came from the north of the Mediterranean. In elevating Vigilius to the episcopal throne of old Rome, Theodora had advanced a man equally versed with herself in the art of double-dealing. Subservient enough, doubtless, while an humble deacon in the train of Agapetus, with an eye directed upon his own interests, no sooner did the compliant and obsequious cleric

close his fingers upon the coveted reward of his hypocrisy, than he forgot the return that was expected by the royal mistress who had so highly favored him, and, feeling himself occupant of the highest position in the Church, resolved still to take counsel of ambition. The Roman see, however, was not as independent of Constantinople as it had been in the days of Leo. The sceptre of Italy, seized by the barbarian after it had dropped from the nerveless grasp of Augustulus, was now being torn from his clutch by that illustrious general who restored to the imperial arms almost the lustre of their brightest sheen. Hence Vigilius could not assume the independent tone that had characterized some of his immediate predecessors as high dignitaries of another realm. Indeed, it is not unlikely that he would readily have stooped still to court the favor of Justinian, had not the temper of his clergy and people been so strongly opposed to such a step that he could not venture to follow the bent of his own inclinations. That he took the course he did was owing, not certainly to the strength of his convictions, but rather to the determined stand made by the Africans, the bishops of Illyria and Dalmatia, and others, against what they believed to be encroachments upon the domain of religion.

Not easily to be turned from his purpose, the emperor, also prompted, it is said, in taking this measure by fear of another schism of Old and New Rome, summoned the western patriarch to Constantinople; in the neighborhood of which city he was obliged to spend more than seven years. Vigilius soon weakly signed a secret covenant to condemn the Three Chapters, attempted in vain to draw over to that side the members of a synod which was held at the imperial city in 548, and then imitated the example of his sovereign by issuing a paper of compromise, which is known as his *Judicatum*, and endeavoring to obtain the separate signatures of the bishops. The spirited resistance of North Africa and Illyria to the requisitions of Justinian at length awoke a corresponding courage within the vacillating bosom of the Latin, so that he positively refused to subscribe a second profession of faith, which the emperor put forth in 551, and threatened all who should affix their names with sentence of excommunication. This bold defiance drove the patriarch from Constantinople to Chalcedon and the church of St. Euphemia, in which he found those benefits of sanctuary he had vainly sought in a metropolitan church; from the very altar of which he had been

dragged by the soldiers with a violence that just escaped burying him beneath its ruins.

The Latins seemed tolerably united in their resistance. Datius of Milan was conspicuous as a leader of the opposition, and two of Vigilius's own attendant deacons did not hesitate in the matter of his Judicatum to go the length of even renouncing church-fellowship with their recreant chief. In Africa several names became illustrious. Pontianus has already been mentioned. When the emperor's first edict reached Africa, he replied to the effect that he and his fellow-bishops did not care to anathematize men who had already gone before the infallible Judge, or condemn writings of which they knew nothing; and administered a solemn warning, in the true tone of a Jeremiah, to be very cautious how he disturbed the peace of God's people. Fulgentius Ferrandus had the honor of being consulted, though only a deacon, by Vigilius through two delegates, who were dispatched to obtain his valuable and learned opinion upon the matters in dispute, when the imperial pressure was first brought to bear upon that fickle-minded Roman; and pronounced clearly and boldly against the edict on the grounds that it derogated from the authority of the Fourth Council, that it passed judgment upon those who were no longer amenable to human law, and that it aspired to the dignity and absolute domination of inspired Scripture. Reparatus of Carthage, after presiding over a synod which presumed to excommunicate the successor of St. Peter, went to Constantinople for the purpose of attending a council in 551, and was deposed and banished because neither bribes, smooth speeches, nor threats could shake his fidelity. Facundus of Hermiane, an outspoken delegate at one of the synods, and the author of a remarkable treatise written in defense of the Three Chapters and addressed to Justinian, whom he rebukes for intruding into a province which does not belong to the civil ruler, perhaps deserves to close the list.

The main objections brought forward against condemning the Three Chapters may be ranged under two heads,—respect for the authority of Chalcedon, and repugnance to anathematizing the dead. A third has already been mentioned, but, inasmuch as the decree of Justinian never was elevated into the position he claimed for it, this objection being leveled against that claim was only of transient importance. As concerns the former of the two above

specified, the authority of Chalcedon certainly was not impugned, even indirectly, unless it was so in the matter of Ibas's letter; for Theodore's writings had been in no way sanctioned by that council, nor had those of Theodoret against which the decree was aimed. The assembled bishops had done little more for their brother of Cyrus than merely to accept his repentance upon his abjuring Nestorianism. And as for the letter, the honor of Chalcedon was saved even in regard to it by treating it as a base imitation of the one which had been approved by that synod. This point must be admitted to have been one of some delicacy: the document under dispute may have been wholly a forgery or a greatly corrupted copy of the genuine one; and it is sure that the Fifth Council would never have consented to cast it out upon any other supposition. Yet we are not compelled to show that such a forgery actually had been made, in order to rescue our theory of General Councils from total overthrow. The confirmation of the sentiments and expressions in the letter was not a matter of great moment to the world at large. Beyond a fraternal interest, the great Church, east and west, did not care very much whether Theodore, Theodoret, and Ibas were orthodox or not. What concerned it was whether the doctrine of one composite nature was true or false, and that was it upon which the attention of the provincial churches was concentrated, to the neglect of the minor matters which came before the council. That was the great question under discussion, and it was large enough to eclipse most others. It is not to be supposed that an Œcumenical Council is authoritative as to all its decisions: that would be the case, to be sure, did the full power and right to decide lie in the council itself, but not if the ultimate appeal is to the judgment of the entire mass. If it is the ratification that constitutes the œcumenicity, then it appears rational enough to limit the authoritativeness to the matters actually passed upon by the Church at large; which is equivalent to circumscribing it by the boundaries of those topics which can be supposed momentous enough, under all the circumstances, to have engrossed public notice. The letter of Ibas at the time of the former gathering was not generally known; it was probably only incidentally brought before the assemblage as bearing upon the propriety of restoring the deposed bishop of Edessa, and certainly obtained no mention in the formulary of faith: therefore, we cannot think that the orthodoxy of the document came at all

before the churches. Of course, Chalcedon *might* have been committed to it in such a way as almost to stand or fall with it: fortunately, however, it did not entrust its fate to so frail a craft, but left that perilous enterprise to the succeeding council, which did stake its good name, not, however, upon the seaworthiness of the bark, but upon its unseaworthiness. The Second Council of Constantinople, in bearing witness so energetically against that ill-starred writing, lifted it by main force into an importance which hardly belonged to it; and, had that synod made a mistake regarding it, we would hardly hope to obtain a hearing for such a plea as we are now gratuitously offering in behalf of Chalcedon,—one, perhaps, which would grate upon the ears of Ferrandus and Facundus, were they now alive. The Africans, with all their independence and fidelity, seem to have labored under two misconceptions, pardonable enough to a church that had endured the trials and suffered the deprivations of a long persecution. In the first place, they mistook, apparently, the nature of the action taken by Chalcedon upon the writings of Theodoret and Ibas; and, in the second place, they did not manifest a very accurate understanding of the doctrine of General Councils, lending countenance to the notion that the final authority resides in the council itself. If we should pass a general stricture upon the conciliar age, and say that, while it *acted* correctly upon the true theory of Œcumenicity, it did not thoroughly comprehend that theory, we would be thought by many to have made a damaging admission. Well, then, so much the worse for the theory, since the facts can hardly be denied. If sore beset by our antagonists, we will take refuge behind the general truth that people often obey with tolerable exactness a principle of which they know almost nothing. Is it necessary, in order for a man to preserve a perpendicular attitude, that he should be familiar with the rule of mechanics, that a line dropped from his centre of gravity must not fall outside of the base? The subject never having been exhaustively, or even attentively studied, the common language and the common thought about it were liable to the reproach of vagueness and inadequateness, and sometimes, perhaps, of downright error.

While disposed to treat the Africans with all possible respect, we cannot coïncide with their second objection, any more than their first. It is contemptible, most assuredly, to persecute the dead. He who will defame one that has lain down to rest in

peace and honor, in order to gratify inextinguishable hate or to magnify himself at his expense, deserves the pillory of universal detestation. It is a shameful deed unnecessarily to reveal even the truth about the departed, should the disclosure involve discreditable transactions. But are there no imaginable circumstances that will justify the throwing of blame upon one whose earthly account has been closed? If the doctrinal errors of a religious teacher have led multitudes astray, is it wrong to lay before the deceived evidence proving that the heresiarch's private life was not quite so blameless as he had wished to make it appear? The rights of praising and of blaming being correlatives, is it not true that the title to one involves that to the other? Now, men that have gone far beyond the reach of earthly tribunals are canonized, formally among some, actually among all. The obloquy and detraction, which not infrequently cling to a great and good soul through his life, perish with the faction which sought to trample him in the mud, and then the impartial judgment of posterity hastens to envelop his ghost in an aureole of glory. Is not this a commendable, though tardy, deed? Or did the world sin in hallowing the fetters which the tyranny of a jealous sovereign bound upon the hands which had given him a new continent? What is fair and proper on one side can hardly be unfair and improper on the other. If it be allowable and commendable to canonize a dead man who deserves such treatment, how can it be wrong to condemn and anathematize another who merits such opprobrium? No attempt is thereby made to forestall the decision of infinite justice, nor to punish the departed soul; but the whole aim of the sentence is to correct the ideas of the living, and to warn them against participating in the errors of the condemned. If Origen actually did teach a pernicious heresy concerning the future of unrepentant sinners, or the bishop of Mopsuestia did dishonor the Son of God by dividing Him into two persons, what is to hinder one of us, or all of us, or a national church, or the great corporate body, from declaring that he was to be blamed for so doing? To excommunicate a person with whom no outward communion can be held, is ridiculous, it may be; but to pronounce him reprobate, which is all that such an anathema amounts to, is a reasonable act, and one that may be conducive to the very best results. For such a course of action the fortunate ingenuity of Eutychius, when only a resident com-

missioner at Constantinople, discovered a Scriptural precedent, which so greatly delighted Justinian that he soon promoted him to the patriarchate of that metropolis: after the prophets of Baal had been consigned to their tombs, Josiah, that pious king, had their remains exhumed and burned.

Soon after the accession of the new patriarch, and in the year 553, all the Eastern patriarchs and other bishops, to the number of one hundred and sixty-five in all, including five from Africa, met at Constantinople, and organized themselves into the Fifth General Council. Vigilius resisted all solicitations to attend, and would doubtless have shared the doom of Reparatus, the heroic shepherd of Carthage, and been sent into banishment, had not the emperor feared that such action would have rent the Church in twain once more. He could more safely be punished by excommunication, and was accordingly, at the emperor's request, stricken from the diptychs. The collected wisdom of Christendom not only condemned the Roman bishop,—in strange forgetfulness of the prerogatives which we are told were always his,—but adopted the imperial policy in general, condemning the Three Chapters and all their adherents, together with Theodore of Mopsuestia, but sparing the memories of Theodoret and Ibas. The council having thus approved the course chosen by the imperious ruler, it still remained to be seen whether the approval would be ratified by the West. Vigilius, succumbing at last to the dreariness of his prolonged confinement, and to the dread of worse results should he persist in his opposition, stooped, the next year, to a most humiliating recantation and submission, gaining thereby the long-coveted permission to return home. As he died on the journey at Syracuse, his archdeacon, Pelagius, succeeded to the vacant seat through the influence of his royal master, who knew him to be a warm friend of the late council. Rome proceeded to enforce acceptance of the synodical decrees by measures more consonant with the nature and spirit of temporal sovereignty than of that mild rule which alone ought to have place in the kingdom of Christ. The repugnance of the whole West to the Constantinopolitan decrees, gave birth to a persistent and firm rejection of them, which for awhile survived the deposition and banishment of leading bishops and the substitution of creatures of Justinian's. Milan and Ravenna cut themselves loose from the apostolic see, and, but for the terrors of the Lombard invasion, would doubtless

have stood out, and forced the patriarch to come over on their side. With better fortune or loftier courage, Aquileia, disdaining to yield when once she had undertaken the contest, erected herself into a patriarchate, and maintained her independence for nearly a century and a half. Nevertheless, the decrees of the Second Council of Constantinople gradually won their way into universal recognition.

Such is the history of the Fifth General Council, and it contains much to provoke severe comment. As its decrees did not directly determine anything of doctrinal importance, we could see it stricken from the list of Œcumenical synods with less regret than any of the others. It is always sad to mark the right resorting to wrongful methods in order to triumph; the truth of God, revealed by Christ, entrusted to a divinely organized Church, and guarded by the Holy Spirit, calling upon the secular arm to support the shaking ark. To exact of people possessed of average intelligence and independence that they should attach much importance to a consent wrung from churches by outrageous tyranny, and call that final agreement of coërcion *the voice of the Spirit*, or even the *reliable testimony* of the ecclesiastical corporation, exposes one to the charge of insulting their reason. Nevertheless, there is, of course, another side to it all, and the view from another stand-point may reduce us to something like patience with a theory we were about to discard. If imperial interposition eventually extorted assent, was it not due to imperial interference, in the first place, that any extortion became necessary? Suppose that, when Pontianus had professed ignorance of the Three Chapters, instead of Justinian's continuing to insist peremptorily upon the submission of the Africans, the comprehensive and sedate intellect of a Gregory Nazianzen, or the powerful and massive mind of an Athanasius, had undertaken to enlighten and mildly persuade the noble leaders of that sorely-tried portion of the Christian Church. Is is not probable that a satisfactory settlement of the whole controversy could in that way have been reached without recourse to dungeons and deserts? Is it necessary to believe that the Spirit of Christ had forsaken His Church, because the corrupt ways of the secular world had invaded it? Is it inconceivable that the various influences which emanated from the throne may have been made to counterbalance each other, so that out of the conflict of errors and sins truth and righteousness

were evolved? May we not boldly affirm that, had the opposition of the West been really based upon sound principles, it would never have yielded to the pressure of despotism, secular or ecclesiastical, but have struggled on to a final victory, with the invincible courage and irrepressible ardor of conscious and divinely-sustained right?

CHAPTER XIII.

THE THIRD COUNCIL OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

As the serious believer views with trembling amazement the utter indifference to the things of an invisible world displayed by many whose doom for eternity hangs upon a thread, so the unbelieving, the worldly, the abandoned, look with profound contempt upon the zeal that sometimes marks the soldier of the cross. To him who rejects the immortality of the soul and ridicules all distinctions between virtue and vice, it must seem supremely ludicrous that any one should put himself out of his way, even so much as a single step, for the visionary purpose of conforming to an imaginary law. To the man who denies the existence of a God, it is the height of folly to dispute about His nature, and to the one who scoffs at the idea that the Infinite became finite, it is little short of insanity to reason about the personality and natures of our Lord and Saviour. If the Christian thought it right to retort in kind upon these men who, standing on the icy pinnacles of their pride, look down through pale moonlight upon the busy scene where life and death struggle for the eternal victory, it would be easy for him to turn around upon the geologist, for instance, with a sneer at his making so much ado over the mark of a skeleton in a rock, or the astronomer, with a smile at his infatuation in traveling thousands of miles and spending months of time in order to rectify the length of a transit by a second or two; but he has been taught not to render railing for railing. The astronomer, the geologist, the chemist, the grammarian are not chargeable with folly in expending their energies upon the most minute investigations. "De minimis non curat lex" (*the law does not concern itself about very small matters*), is a maxim which must be very strictly construed, since, in the trial of a cause or in the search after evidence, in governing a realm or defending a fortress, in computing the parallax of Sirius or deciphering a

monolith, the very smallest error may produce most disastrous consequences. The tone of mind which surveys with lofty pity the historic battle-fields of religion, sighing over the folly that could contend in such a strife, is an ancient one, one honorable not only for the hoariness of age, but for the high positions it has filled. In quite ancient times it sat upon the throne and wore the imperial robes, a sort of ecclesiastical *Mayor of the palace* to some of the best and most famous, as well as to some of the worst, sovereigns of the Roman Decadence. It was natural that the monarch who had to dispute with Chosroes and the chagan for the possession of his palace, should deem it of more importance that his subjects should present an unbroken front to the enemy than that their faith should be strictly orthodox. The Greek empire was surrounded with powerful foes, and the day was gone by when its terror affrighted the nations. The name *Roman*, instead of falling upon the ear with an awful sound, had become contemptible, and was used by the barbarians as the basest of epithets. Even when the valor and skill of Belisarius and the eunuch Narses restored to the Roman armies something of their pristine renown and taught the invaders to fly before their awakened wrath, their imperial master felt that his triumph must be short-lived indeed, unless the internal dissensions of his own people could be allayed. So Justinian, more concerned for the preservation and increase of his own authority than for the promotion of His glory whom he acknowledged as his God, put forth his decree of compromise. Then followed the weak and impious Zeno with his Henoticon, as another compromise. Flushed with his victories in the far East, Heraclius returns to his palace, and, hopeful of equally brilliant success in other contests, issues a compromise, which is known as his *Ecthesis*. The hand of Constans II., red with fratricidal blood, writes a compromise that history calls a *Type*. Each of these attempts, so far from serving the end proposed by their authors, only widened the existing breach or created a new one, causing sometimes a schism, and sometimes a new sect, to spring up. The beatitude pronounced upon peace-makers was hardly needed to convice us that no nobler work can be undertaken by mortal man than that of appeasing strife. Yet it is on all sides confessed that too high a price can be paid for peace. It is not to be bought at the price of chains and slavery, either actual or metaphorical; but the war

of extermination, devastation, and utter ruin, is to be chosen rather. A lawful compromise between disputants may be very laudable: not so an accommodation which involves a surrender of any portion of the true faith. The sacred deposit was entrusted to the custody of the saints in order that they should preserve it pure, intact, and whole, not that they should permit the enemy to handle it and take from it what he chose. Even if the primary duty of Christians were to save souls, that would be accomplished best, not by throwing away the gospel of redemption, nor by consenting to ignore any portion of it, but by fearlessly proclaiming and maintaining the whole of divinely-revealed truth, even though some parts thereof be extremely unpalatable to certain classes of people. Is it not better to alienate a class, than to rob all succeeding generations of the saving knowledge which we are bound to transmit as perfect in all respects as we received it? Moreover, if we thought that the salvation of the entire race could be achieved by the blotting out of one single fact or principle, which had concentrated upon itself the ineradicable hostility of a large proportion of mankind, even then it would be high treason against the King of Kings for the Church to suffer it to be erased from her standards or passed over in silence by her preachers. The deadly warfare between truth and error admits of no compromise.

The heresy which next extensively troubled the Church was in itself an attempt at compromise. The council of Chalcedon had decided that there exist in Christ two distinct and perfect natures, combined, without absorption, change, or fusion, in one personality. It was hardly to be supposed that either of these natures remained quiescent. Some quiescence of the divine nature was doubtless included in His abstaining from the putting forth of its energies in His own behalf to relieve Himself, for instance, from hunger; but that was no more than the restraint which divine goodness must put upon itself whenever it permits the innocent to suffer: in the abstract, it is hardly more conceivable that God should cease to act than that He should cease to exist. As for the human nature, that was assumed for the very purpose that it might energize. If, then, the two natures were to be active, and they were distinct natures, it would follow that their activities must be separate. The unity of individuality no more involves the unity of operation of the two natures than the unipersonality of man constitutes breathing a function of his soul,

or thinking a function of his circulatory system. It will be replied that man's thinking *is* a double energizing, and that this can be proved from the fact that bodily disease disorders the mind. But such an objection cannot be sustained, inasmuch as the spiritual nature within man *can* rise superior to almost every bodily affection, and manifest the utmost strength and healthfulness while the poor frame lies emaciated with the ravages of fever, or racked with intensest pain. The mind employs physical organs as its servants, but does not permit them, in the sense in which we are now speaking, to modify its own action. Just as a nature which possesses no distinctive qualities is no nature at all, so qualities which do not separately energize, are no qualities at all. If two natures are fused, entirely separate action is, of course, impossible to them; if they are only partially commingled, the activities that ensue are energizings of the *third somewhat*, as far as the commingling extends; and, on the other hand, if the operation under scrutiny is found to be the conjoint action of two natures, it inevitably follows that these have ceased to be separate, and become more or less commixed. Cannot two men produce a result of their joint skill, without being run into each other like two streams of molten metal poured into one trough? some reader exclaims in surprise. Of course they can, but they cannot strike the same blow with two different hammers: they may bring their hammers down with equal strength upon the same spot, and cause an aggregate result; but for all that the two sledges struck each its own blow. In this illustration each workman represents a nature, the hammers are qualities, and the blow an energizing: whence we conclude that if the energizing is single, so is the quality which produced it, and the nature which lies behind the quality; and if the energizing is compound, so is the nature whence it came.

It appears that a work then in high regard, and attributed to Dionysius the Areopagite, contained the expression *ἐνέργεια θεανδρικὴ* (a Theandric energy or operation), as predicable of Christ. A *Theandric energy* being, in plain English, the energy of a God-man, it is evident that such a phrase could be used in regard to Christ, who was the God-man, without meaning to imply that the action itself belonged to both natures. We are here reminded of the old dispute about the Theotokos, and that the epithet, as applied to the Virgin Mary, signified not that she was the parent of the divine nature of Christ, but that from her came the human

nature of Him who is at once man and God. Certain unwarrantable inferences were, however, drawn from the above expression, and the doctrine invented that, although the two natures remained distinct, their operations were conjoint. Perhaps the idea can be conveyed by using the analogy of two gases, like oxygen and hydrogen, which, upon being forced from separate receivers through a single stop-cock, issue in combination, having resolved themselves into a *third somewhat*, which is a mechanical mixture or a chemical compound, as the case may be.

Why the will should have been selected as the special field of dispute is a question of some obscurity, since, if any operation was theandric, all must have been, and the human and the divine emotions and intellectual processes must have been blended, as well as the volitions of the Saviour. Still, as the will is that capacity which lies nearest the inmost throne and centre of individuality, and to which moral responsibility attaches itself most firmly; and as the Predestinarian controversy had brought into marked prominence the nature, value, and strength of the human will, and its relation to the divine, it is not extraordinary that in an age of vague psychology a discussion concerning the character of the theandric operations should have revolved about the *Will* of our adorable Lord as a pivot. Thus the distinction gradually arose between those who believed in one will,—or *Monothelites*, as John Damascenus called them,—and the Dyothelites, or believers in two wills.

As soon as the controversy is narrowed down to the will of the Saviour, it has been greatly simplified. It is obvious to urge upon the Monothelites that their theory virtually removes all meritoriousness from His obedience, since that resides mainly in the overcoming of the obstacles interposed by a rebellious will, and the divine will of the Son cannot be supposed contrarient in the slightest degree to that of the Father. The will of a sinless human being may incline momentarily, at least, toward evil, though it never yields to the temptation; but the will of God the Son cannot know a tendency to aberration, even as inappreciable as the tendency of our sun to rush out towards the orbit of Neptune. By bending His human will into a cheerful compliance with His Father's injunctions, Christ could be said to learn obedience by the things which He suffered; but how His divine will, in any sort of combination whatever, could learn obedience, we can never

understand till we comprehend the possibility of the All-wise increasing His store of wisdom, and the All-good improving in virtue. That part of the Catholic doctrine of the atonement, which requires a perfect obedience on the part of our great Representative, as a compensating weight to be set in the balances of eternal justice over against our disobedience, is irreconcilably hostile to a theory which removes His operations so far asunder from those of ordinary men as to make it no *human* obedience at all,—if, indeed, it does not quite rob it of the very name of obedience. Let him who still wavers between two opinions contemplate that solemn scene on the night of the betrayal, and listen to the cry, "Not as I will, but as thou wilt."

Such was the grand doctrinal compromise by which it was attempted to bring the Monophysites back into the Church. It was an attempt to accomplish a philosophical impossibility, to express the method of contact of two separate natures. The problem of contact, or of the transmission of force from one body to another, has not yet even the hope of being solved. Nothing in nature is known to touch absolutely anything else. By applying the microscope to the densest bodies, we will discover that their atoms are so far from lying contiguous that they are flying perpetually backwards and forwards with amazing velocity. It is not to be thought that when the cannon-ball strikes against solid granite, any one particle of the projectile really comes into contact with a particle of the rock; nor even that the particles of air which are crushed by the awful concussion actually touch either substance. What, then, stops the immense mass in its rapid course? We wait for science to inform us. How does the mind act upon the body? How can a physical chain of causes be set in motion by that which is wholly immaterial? Let no one rashly follow the dramatic precedent of vowing not to break his fast till he has answered any one of these and similar questions, lest he should doom himself to a worse fate than that of a two-centuries' *sleep*. Now, precisely this same problem of contact was undertaken by the Monothelites. In the God-man, a single personality, coëxisted two distinct natures. Unquestionably these natures acted upon each other and upon the personality to which they belonged; but how was this done? How shall that personality contrive, as it were, to shut off the influence of one nature while it places itself under that of the other? How, for example, could

the blessed Saviour exclude from Himself His divine attributes while as a man he wrestled for man with the Devil in the wilderness, or to such an extent that He could profess His ignorance of the day of Judgment? Who of sane mind can expect ever to understand such a mystery? The facts are certain, that there was only a single personality, that there continued to coëxist in it two separate and unaltered natures, and that each of these had its own appropriate mode of operation; but how these facts are explainable no one, we submit, need expect to understand till he has at least pierced the secrets of his own being, and informed an eager world how the spiritual essence of his own mind manages to convey its impulses to the material substance of his brain.

The first twelve years of Heraclius's reign saw his dominions gradually shrink within themselves, till they comprised little more than the imperial city, only a few maritime cities and provinces in addition still acknowledging his sceptre. The Avars had inundated Thrace and dashed against the very walls of Constantinople. The Persians had engulfed Syria, Palestine, Egypt, and Asia Minor, and were now surging and leaping in threatening proximity to the defenses of Chalcedon. It seemed as though the proud metropolis must be crushed beneath the encountering tides, as a gallant ship is sometimes ground into fragments by the ice-floes of the Arctic seas. But her lord was equal to the occasion, sloughing off at once the shameful garb of effeminate ease, and donning with alacrity the rough garments of the warrior. Taking counsel of that lofty daring which is not seldom the highest prudence, he left his capital in the state of siege, embarked his troops upon galleys and ploughed back again the furrows made by his adventurous keel when he had sailed up the Hellespont from Africa to dethrone the tyrant Phocas. The battle-field of Issus once more beheld a martial host. In several engagements the royal hero chastised the insolence of the invaders, and then established his winter-quarters on the banks of the Halys. Again entrusting his forces to the perilous deep, Heraclius transported five thousand men to Trebizond, and thence penetrated into the enemy's country, carrying everything before him in his victorious march. In a later campaign he stood fatigued, but triumphant, on the very plain of ancient Nineveh, having, after a most stubborn resistance, routed the vast army of Rhazates, and possibly slain that general with his own hand. When at length the emperor resumed in his

own palace the robes of peace, although the laurels of six glorious campaigns encircled his brows, although he could congratulate himself that the brilliant sunlight of Assyria had gleamed as brightly upon his eagles as upon the locked shields of the Macedonian phalanx, although Avars and Persians alike had disappeared from the shores of the Bosporus, although the eastern boundary of the empire had been restored, he did not forget to ascribe the success of his arms to the favor of the Lord God of Hosts. In acknowledgment of the goodness of Jehovah, the pious sovereign visited Jerusalem on a pilgrimage, and restored the true cross (as he supposed) to the holy sepulchre. His piety also prompted him to seek new victories in the theological field. Why should not the same skill, prudence, and courage which had driven Chosroës from the suburbs of Constantinople, and then from his throne, and bestowed the inestimable blessing of peace upon the subjects of the Greek empire, carry him with equal applause through the more difficult struggles of theological warfare? Precisely because the approbation of his own conscience, the loyal devotion of his subjects, and the smile of Heaven, which attend a legitimate monarch who goes nobly forth to do battle against overwhelming odds in defense of his realm, must be expected to desert him should he undertake to arbitrate with the strong arm in the affairs of an independent province. It is said that his coming in contact with the Nestorians in Persia caused him to reflect seriously upon the policy which had alienated so important and numerous a body of Christians from the church and empire. What a pity it is that he did not read correctly the lesson of that alienation, and learn from it the folly and impiety of the civil ruler's presuming to extend his sway into the kingdom of the Lord! As it was, he only resolved to be a little more prudent and sagacious than his predecessors.

It is reported that Heraclius, during his expeditions, actually entered into negotiations with Monophysite leaders, in the hope of winning them back into the fold upon the basis of the Monothelite compromise. In 626 he saw fit to consult Cyrus, bishop of Phasis, concerning the doctrine of a single operation of the two natures; who, by a favorable answer, so thoroughly established himself in the emperor's good graces, that he soon ascended the steps of the Alexandrian patriarchal throne. This answer, however, had not been given till he had obtained from Sergius of Con-

stantinople the assurance that his predecessor in the patriarchate, Mennas, had spoken of "one will and one life-giving operation," and that similar language could be found upon the pages of Cyril and other orthodox fathers. In 633 Cyrus congratulated himself upon having reconciled the Theodosians by means of a compromise extended through nine articles. Sophronius, thinking that an agreement which enabled the separatists to proclaim that the council of Chalcedon had gone over to them,—instead of their having gone over to the council,—was dangerous as well as disgraceful, strove to avert from the Church the catastrophe he dreaded. The earnest and tearful supplications of the learned monk drew from the patriarch a proposal to refer the whole matter to Sergius. Being a Monothelite, that dignitary was of course disposed to favor Cyrus, but still, knowing full well the almost certain consequences of offending a brother of the monastic confraternities, advised him, without changing even the distasteful seventh article, to let the whole matter rest where it was, and refrain from employing language favoring either one will or two. Sophronius was driven into a promise of silence by a demand to produce any explicit authority for *two* operations; which he was at the time unable to do,—though he is said to have afterwards collected six hundred passages from the fathers. His promise being considered by him no longer binding when he attained the level of patriarchal dignity at Jerusalem, his first official communication was a labored and able exposition of the Catholic faith in the respect of its maintaining *two operations* and *two wills* in Christ, such being the burden of his enthronistic letter. Sergius, in the search for an ally, drew Honorius of Rome into the controversy, and succeeded in enlisting that prelate on his side, and so eventually bringing him under anathema for heresy. Notwithstanding that the capture of the Holy City by the Arabs soon removed Sophronius from this world, a controversy had been born which was not easily to be suppressed. In 639 Heraclius entered the arena with a decree which prohibited all mention of two operations or of one only, and enjoined all to acknowledge one single will, inasmuch as the Saviour's manhood never produced any motion contrary to the determination of His Godhead. The *Ecthesis* (as the mandate was called) was worse than dubious, clearly advocating the new heresy: its reasoning also was faulty, since the harmonious action of two wills by no means proves their identity, the one with the other. Sergius is

pronounced the real author of the famous document. It obtained the sanction of provincial synods at Constantinople and Alexandria, but was opposed at Rome, and particularly by a council held under John IV., to whom the emperor then wrote disclaiming its authorship.

In 641 Heraclius exchanged the purple for a shroud. Seven months later his grandson, Constans II., began a reign of execrable tyranny which, after twenty-seven years, was closed in a bath by the treachery of an attendant. About the time of his accession, a powerful champion appeared upon the stage in the person of Maximus, whose conscientiousness and religious fervor had drawn him away from an important position at court and a good prospect of rapid promotion, to a life of seclusion as a monk. He was a man of fine abilities and admirable principles, whose productions are said by Neander to deserve the high praise of containing the elements of a complete philosophic system of Christian doctrine. Trembling for the cause of orthodoxy, this man resolved to draw the sword in its defense. In Africa, he enters the lists of argument with the patriarch Pyrrhus, whom the revolution which elevated Constans had induced to seek an asylum there, and completely vanquishes him. The disputants then repair to Rome, where Pyrrhus, who had professed himself convinced by his antagonist, is not only welcomed to communion, but treated as lawful patriarch of Constantinople. One who had shown himself so pliable was not unlikely to bend again, whenever it should suit his convenience to do so, as it happened soon afterwards, upon his coming under the influence of the exarch of Ravenna. His tergiversation exposed him to the just indignation of Theodore and a Roman council, which excommunicated him. And now the tyrant himself must step in and issue a decree: he, this incompetent, cruel, odious creature, must dictate to the Church of God what she shall do under the circumstances! His *Type*, or Model of faith, by commanding both parties to maintain unbroken silence upon the points in dispute, acknowledged, by necessary implication, that the scheme of his grandfather had proved a signal failure, and testified to his sharing in the strange notion of that renowned ancestor, that the flame of controversy can be quenched by clapping an extinguisher upon it. Despots fall into the same mistake when they think to make people less restive under their misrule by suppressing freedom of speech. Do they forget that irritation of feel-

ing demands some vent, and will have it? Do they not know that anger will often evaporate in loud proclamations of its direful purposes which, otherwise, its compressed energies might impel it to accomplish? Besides, who regards such prohibitions? Men may converse with bated breath, but they will canvass all the more certainly all questions which are interdicted, because of their very interdiction. Moreover, when the forbidden topic is one regarded as of vital importance, the injunction is peculiarly aggravating if it seems to insult the understandings of those who are zealous partisans by virtually telling them that they are quarreling about nothing. So the Type only served to fan the fire, and caused it to flame up more fiercely.

There were not lacking men of independence, courage, and self-devotion to oppose the new edict; foremost among whom was Maximus, that dauntless and tireless spirit, who left no means untried of stirring up the faithful to do their duty in the premises. His energetic efforts were so successful, that the Roman pontiff was besieged with appeals to arouse himself in defense of the dogmatic faith. An unsatisfactory correspondence between Rome and Constantinople had resulted in Theodore's anathematizing Paul by the authority of a council, and in Paul's overturning the altar of the papal chapel at Constantinople, and otherwise insulting his brother patriarch. The Type went forth in 648. The next year Theodore gave place, by death, to Martin I., who immediately convoked the first *Lateran* council, so called from being held close by the Lateran palace, in the "basilica (*or church*) of Constantine." It was no inconsiderable gathering, for the archbishop of Ravenna and other bishops attended to the number of one hundred and five. The spirit of Sophronius found utterance from the lips of Stephen of Dor, who, obedient to the solemn charge of his former superior, stood there to urge the condemnation of Monothelism. The Manes of that dead hero must have been appeased by the bold denunciations leveled in twenty canons against that heresy and all who favored it. Clear testimony was borne to the doctrine of two united wills and two operations, and against the oft and easily perverted expression of "one theandric operation." Theodore of Paran, one of the ablest advocates of the heresy, our old friend Cyrus of Alexandria, and three patriarchs of New Rome,—Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul,—were included in one general sentence of doom, which also reached to such inanimate

objects as the "most impious Ecthesis" of Sergius and Heraclius, and the "most impious Type" of Paul and Constans. Martin took no pains to smooth down the asperities of such decided action, but proceeded to communicate its decrees by letter, not only to the various bishops and patriarchs who had not been present at the sessions of the council, but to the sovereign himself. It is surprising that the rage which must have inflamed the royal bosom permitted Martin the long respite of more than three years, especially when we remember that, while the synod was yet sitting, an imperial mandate had already sent the exarch Olympius to Rome, with instructions to enforce the Type and dispatch the Pope to Constantinople. For unexplained reasons, Olympius forbore to execute his orders, so that it was not till Theodore Calliopas had succeeded him that the venerable prelate was seized.

After sorrowing over the gradual decline of learning and piety as exhibited in the history of the three preceding general councils, we feel the pleasurable sensation of reviving hope as we dwell upon the narrative of the Sixth and last, and discover here and there a character not wholly unworthy of ranking with the fathers and confessors of an earlier period. We cannot, perhaps, urge much in behalf of the proficiency of the disputants in theological knowledge, though Maximus seems to have been a divine of whom no age need be ashamed; but we are, above measure, rejoiced at finding more than one champion whom danger, difficulty, and death could not teach to yield, and who, instead of contenting himself with repelling assaults made upon his own person, sallied bravely forth in order to break a lance for any who needed his assistance. The North Africans of the last century had done yeoman service for the great cause, but they mainly labored to defend their own entrenchments. However, far be it from us to disparage such men as Reparatus and Facundus. All honor to the noble band that had run the gauntlet of Vandal-Arian persecution. Look now at Sophronius. We have seen him ride forth alone upon a perilous enterprise, thoughtless of self. It remains for us to accompany the patriarch as he leads his chief suffragan to the awful spot which witnessed the crucifixion of the One about the nature of whose operations the conflict raged, and in view perhaps of the baleful crescent which already waved over Zion, most solemnly charges him to seek the Latin patriarch, who had so often stood in the breach against heresy, and never cease to im-

portune him till that error had been condemned against which he had himself been contending so manfully since the day he threw himself at the feet of Cyrus. That suffragan was Stephen of Dor, who thenceforth seems to have devoted himself to the task laid upon him, and to have constituted himself the champion of an Idea. And why not? What grander spectacle does earth afford than that of a man who sacrifices himself joyously upon the altar of an Idea? All honor to him who, despising ease, safety, riches, and pleasure, turning resolutely aside from the glittering prizes held before his eyes by ambition, and denying himself even the sweet solaces of home and family affection, enlists beneath the banner of some true and mighty Idea, and goes down cheerfully to death only grieving that Providence has not spared him long enough to behold the sure triumph for which he longed. Such a hero was Maximus, who ever and anon looms up upon our vision in radiant majesty as, Agamemnon-like, he speeds hither and thither inciting the chiefs to bold and vigorous effort against the foe. Surrendering everything, he gives himself up to the work, resolved that heresy shall not overthrow the standard of the Cross, if his best endeavors can avert such a catastrophe. Where dislike of Monothelism prevails he fans it into a holy abhorrence, and where it has not yet been lit he strives to collect dry tinder for the spark. Careless of coldness and neglect, superior to hatred and defiance, he goes calmly on in his pilgrimage, glowing with holy zeal, patient of delay, and prepared for any fate. But the chief martyr was he whom the patriarchal throne exposed to peculiar odium. When the new exarch arrived in Rome he found the pope lying on a sick-bed in the Lateran church. There, surrounded by his clergy and shielded by the sanctity of the altar, he heard his sentence of deposition from his bishopric and deportation to Constantinople from the lips of Calliopas, who, after taking all the precautions of extreme cowardice to guard against the danger of a popular uprising, had at last ventured to lead an armed band within the hallowed walls. A word from Martin would have brought to his side the frantic rage of the populace, and doomed the imperial emissary to instant and terrible destruction; but that gentle-spirited prelate rebuked the inconsiderate zeal of his advisers, declaring that he would ten times rather see his own blood shed than that of a single follower flowing in his behalf. At midnight the poor old man was hurried away, without the company

of the friends who had eagerly accepted the general permission to attend him, and carried to the port; the gates of Rome being thereafter kept shut till the vessel had sailed, on board of which he had been conveyed. Throughout the protracted voyage he was treated with unnecessary rigor, being closely confined to the ship while others were refreshing themselves on shore, and during a whole year's stay at Naxos denied all the comforts that humanity would have conceded even to a hardened culprit in the forlorn condition of this sick old man, no friends being allowed to break in upon the tedium of his captivity with kindly words and loving sympathy, and all presents of such articles of food as would have tended to restore his wasted strength being rejected with insults to the givers. All discomforts of body and humiliations of soul were borne with meek resignation and heroic fortitude. His letters written at this juncture breathe the spirit of Christian patience and trust. He survived these miseries, only to encounter greater when once he had reached the imperial city. What shall we think of a ruler who could leave such a sufferer lying on deck through the hours of a long day exposed to the jeers of the class that frequents the wharfs of a great emporium, and then compel him to drag out weary months in a dungeon before obtaining a hearing? After a trial which was a mere mockery of justice and an exhibition of detestable cruelty, he was consigned to another prison. To the other miseries of his lot was added that of being paraded in public as a condemned criminal. The old man's dignity did not desert him in any of these trying scenes. Whether ridiculed by a ribald populace or abused by the officers of the law, he never ceased to remember that he stood in a higher presence than that of man. While the hounds of Constans bayed around his venerable form and dared to claim for themselves the name of Christians, though so feeble that his tottering knees scarcely upheld his weight even with the support of attendants, his indomitable spirit rose in the sublimity of innocence, and cited his judges to meet him before the Eternal Bar. At length he was dismissed into exile, the intended sentence of death having been commuted, probably at the prayer of Paul, the patriarch of Constantinople, whose animosity was not proof against the solemn reflections of his death-bed. Bidding farewell to his few attendants with a cheerfulness that contrasted strangely with their tears, he was transported across the Black Sea and set ashore in the Crimea. There he passed the

short remainder of his days among barbarians, under all kinds of privation, waiting patiently to be freed from the burden of mortality. His stomach loathed the coarse and unaccustomed fare of the natives, but was granted only the choice between that and starvation. Neglected by his friends, who shrank from offending the tyrant by extending a hand to the wretched outcast, he very naturally grieved at this desertion, and gave vent to his feelings in a letter to one of them, expressing surprise that even his own clergy had forgotten his existence. Abandoned thus to his loneliness and misery, uttering no note of repining louder than we have already listened to, the patient, cheerful, heroic veteran soon fell asleep, and thus received a most welcome release from the fetters of a hopeless captivity. Not to be sated, the sleuth-hounds opened in full cry upon one whose declining years had only added strength to a name which had long been the very bulwark of orthodoxy. They flew upon Maximus and his disciple Anastasius, who for more than thirty years had hardly been separated from each other, dragged them down, flung them into separate dungeons, and then sat howling for their blood. More consideration by far was, for some reason, shown this leader and model of the monastic order, every influence being brought to bear in order to extort such concessions that he could be spared. Did his enemies really reverence his character, or was their forbearance the result merely of a shrewd calculation that to gain Maximus would be to remove the last prop of the Dyothelites? They coaxed, they flattered, they plead, they promised profusely, they threatened terrible things. Then they urged upon him a formula of compromise, brief and vague, which was not incapable of orthodox interpretation. Did they expect to deceive Maximus, and cajole him into even *appearing* to countenance false doctrine? At last the authority of the new pope, Eugenius, whose agents had signed the temporizing formula, was cast upon him, under the hope that his independence would be buried beneath the incumbent mass. From below came the distinct, though half-smothered, voice: Though the bishop of Rome or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel, let him be anathema. What! exclaimed his opponents, Are you alone to be saved? and are all others to perish?—They had, in this question, taught theological disputants to hurl a missile that was destined to be a favorite one against every independent thinker or staunch believer.—His reply is worthy of being com-

mitted to memory by all who have felt, or are likely to feel, the sting of the query: "God forbid that I should condemn any one, or should claim salvation for myself only! But I would rather die than have on my conscience the misery of erring in any way as to the faith." He and his companions were sent to reflect upon their previous course and future prospects at Bizya in Thrace. The expedient of exile also failing to shake their indomitable courage, the wrath which had long impended, at length, intensified by long restraint, burst upon them. Maximus was subjected to the ignominy of a public scourging at Constantinople, was mutilated by the cutting out of his tongue and the loss of his right hand, and then banished to the country of the Lazians, where he soon died, in 662. Like indignities and sufferings were inflicted upon his comrades.

What hope was left for the Church? Who now should bear up the banner of the truth? Anastasius taught his left hand to hold the pen, and his tongueless mouth to articulate speech, but the fourth year saw this redoubtable knight give up the contest, which he had carried on with efficiency from his place of exile till death called him to peace. When he dropped the baton, who should take it up? It was long before that daring mortal showed himself to the world. The fate of Martin had intimidated his successors, so that Eugenius and Vitalian, the two next popes, did not summon resolution enough to oppose Constantinople. The heavens hung black above the Church. The Monothelites raised the shout of victory, and none sent back a counter-cry. Had, then, Sophronius in vain committed that solemn trust to Stephen of Dor? Had Maximus and Martin lived, and struggled, and suffered, and died, to so little purpose? Believe it not, ye that in this generation wear the mantles of those men of God. Never yet did man fight valiantly for the truth, or suffer steadfastly for it, and lose his efforts; not though he stood the last on the field of strife, having seen his routed comrades scattered to the four winds, and himself, disdaining to fly, won at the sword's point in hopeless battle the death he coveted. The memory of his heroism lives on, and becomes a priceless legacy to those that follow. Aye! And the terror of his name lives on, and strikes dismay on after fields to those who knew the strength of his arm, and even to those whose infant ears drank in the tale of his matchless prowess. The trumpet of Maximus shouted the alarm long after the tyrant had

wrenched it from his grasp, and the pious firmness of the martyred pope survived in bosoms that had once loved the bishop they had lacked manliness enough to succor in his hour of sore need. Sad was the fate of the two champions, and bitter the cup that imperial cruelty forced them to drain; but what heart is there so poor as not to envy them the glory of such a record as they have left, the immense advantage of having undergone such a course of discipline, and the boundless satisfaction they must now feel in looking back and seeing what noble service they were permitted to perform for their Lord? Being dead, they still lived, and their memories cheered the brethren on to the fight.

The battle was renewed by Pope Adeodatus, who took the decided step of separating the patriarch of Constantinople from his communion. In retaliation, Theodore, bishop of that city, and Macarius of Antioch, proposed to strike off of their church records, or *diptychs*, the name of Vitalian, the last pope who had been admitted upon their lists. But this expunging could not be attempted without the emperor's consent, and there then sat upon the throne a man of different character from the last despot, his son Constantine, who manifested a sincere desire for the restoration of peace. Though not especially remarkable for any unusual qualities of soul, Constantine Pogonatus (the Bearded) seems to have been a rather better ruler than the average emperors of that age, and to have inclined generally towards the side of clemency and moderation. If he did stain his hands with some acts of cruelty, the fewness of these deeds, and the reluctance with which he approached the supposed necessity of mutilating his brothers, are, at least, refreshing to the mind that has been dwelling upon the abominable transactions of the last reign. In order to heal the schism, he wrote, in 678, a letter to Donus of Rome, requesting him to send delegates to Constantinople, to the end that a conference might be held with a view to the adjusting of differences. Agatho, who had become patriarch on the death of Donus, immediately upon receipt of the missive called a council, at which one hundred and twenty-five bishops were present, and among them Mansuetus of Milan, who was Primate of the Lombard kingdom, two Frankish bishops, and also Wilfrid of York; these four being worthy of mention as not having been subjects of the empire. But one result could be expected from such a council. The Latin Church, invincibly hostile to change,

sought not for truth amid the wranglings of metaphysical discussions, so much as from the calm testimony of tradition, and a collation of passages from approved writers of earlier times; and also possessed far more independence of spirit than the servile Orientals. Monothelism received its certain sentence. Agatho dispatched, thereupon, two bishops and a deacon to represent him at the Bosporus, and put in their hands a letter which was to serve the same purpose, and perhaps win equal distinction, with Leo's celebrated Tome. The council also sent a delegation.

Deeming it best to vary somewhat from his original intention, Constantine resolved to substitute for the proposed conference an œcumenical synod, or something approaching in its nature to such a synod. The Sixth General Council, which was the Third held at Constantinople, and was also called the *Trullan* from the domed roof of the room in the palace which witnessed its sessions, met on the 7th of November, 680, and continued to sit till the 16th of December, in the year 681. Opening with rather a small attendance of bishops, it was able, before its close, to count up nearly two hundred. It was not dignified by the presence of the usual number of patriarchs, those of Jerusalem and Alexandria being represented by two presbyters; George of Constantinople and Macarius of Antioch being therefore the only ones who personally participated in its deliberations. All disputes for the presidency were obviated by the emperor's assuming that honor himself. His felicitous rulings perhaps assisted greatly in giving this council the higher tone which distinguished it above some, at least, of the preceding ones. The long continuance of the synod seems to have been necessitated by the thoroughness of its investigations. The extant productions of orthodox and unorthodox were ransacked and carefully studied; the first, in order both to ascertain as precisely as possible the mind of the earlier church and to support the view finally determined upon with an array of authorities as conclusive and copious as might be; and the second, for the double purpose of settling what exactly the Monothelite doctrine was, and of identifying it, either in whole or in part, with older heresies. Among the former class, none were more influential than those of the grand old hero of the Nicene period, if we may form an opinion from the insertion of the name of "the most wise Athanasius" and the commendatory quotation of his words in the decree of the council. All respect was paid to the communications from the West, the

decisions of the Roman assembly being treated as those of a tribunal of coördinate jurisdiction, which were not to be rejected nor disregarded unless they could be conclusively demonstrated to be erroneous or ill-advised: this was surely a great concession.

There occurred at the fifteenth session a very curious incident, which, besides exposing some of the weak points of human nature, may also be useful to us as indicating the probable results of having recourse to the expedient of a "prayer-gauge," according to the suggestion of a modern professor. It must have been an interesting spectacle which was afforded in the court of the public bath, when the dignified ecclesiastics assembled around a silver bier, on which lay a corpse with a Monothelite creed on its breast, and stood for an hour or two, expectant, while an aged monk whispered in its ear. And, naturally enough, the adherence of the defeated Polychromius to his error, notwithstanding that he had himself proposed the test, was no less persistent than the dead man's slumber. Not put out of countenance even by a failure witnessed by the prelates, the highest officers of the state, and a vast concourse of people, and so palpable that he himself was obliged to acknowledge the discomfiture, he held his faith unshaken through a storm of popular clamor anathematizing *the new Simon*. Yet the man had had the assurance to ask the council to promise a change of its belief in the event of his raising the lifeless body! It may have been something better than superstition that induced the synod to engage in this experiment, for the recoil of the rash attempt upon the one who should make it would be sure to carry popular favor over to the side of the Dyothelites.

The decision that was reached after so many months of laborious study and sustained argumentation approved the theory of *two* natural operations and *two* natural wills, the chief qualification of this view being that the two wills never came into collision, the human will always acting when the humanity was called into activity, but never moving out of harmony with the divine. This proposition, however, is not to be understood as laying down that there never were in the breast of our Saviour any incipient motions towards rebellion, for such tendencies or involuntary desires are not acts of the will in any sense. Whether these were present in Christ is a question which the council did not attempt to solve, wisely refraining from a discussion which is impossible of solution, and can only be very imperfectly illuminated by the

light of those passages of the New Testament which teach that He was susceptible of temptation. How a soul can be tempted which is unconscious of the faintest disposition to transgress, is not apparent to the ordinary intellect; but, passing by that obscure topic, the congregated fathers confined themselves to the declaration that the *positive volitions* of that perfect human mind, the decided acts by which it controlled His human organism, were always in entire accord with the movements of the divine will. By way of illustration, they are not to be understood as telling us that Christ experienced no momentary longing to obey the tempter, and convert the stones into a substance capable of appeasing His gnawing pangs, but merely that He admitted such a craving to continue not one instant after His will could be brought to bear upon it; nor that He felt no shrinking from draining His appointed cup, no desire to escape from the awful fate of crucifixion, but only that He held such emotions under control, and never allowed His will to ally itself with them. Still, on the other side, the divine will never overpowered the human, nor used it as a mere instrument; but the latter energized independently, and, so energizing, harmonized with the former. Such a definition of faith could not, of course, be reached by searching authorities which came into existence before this dispute was begun, but it had to be attained by careful process of reasoning based upon authorities as a groundwork. That logic had to construct the edifice, is no proof that the writings of the fathers and the decisions of councils were useless; nor can any one suppose them useless who does not expect a superstructure to support itself in air, entirely clear of the ground.

It is worthy of especial remark that a successor of St. Peter, an heir (as we are told) to the infallibility of that Prince of Apostles, was included by name in the anathema of the Sixth General Council. As having followed the opinions of the Monothelites, and sanctioned their impious doctrines, a distinct condemnation was, after an extended examination of his letters, pronounced upon Pope Honorius. This sentence Leo II., who had succeeded Agatho before the return of his legates, not only fully ratified, but sought to have approved by his brethren throughout the West.

Thus it appears that Sophronius, Maximus, and Martin had not struggled uselessly. Instead of Monothelism gaining the day,

it now seemed to be hastening towards extinction. Macarius of Antioch, it is true, had persisted in adhering to heretical opinions, and been cast out with his disciple, Stephen; but the Saracen conquests had robbed him of the importance which might have made his see the stronghold of a new sect. Gradually the decrees of the last General Council worked their way into universal approval, but not without encountering some obstacles. The pendulum oscillated several times before it reached a perpendicular. A fresh dispute, which broke out between the two great patriarchs during the reign of Justinian II., retarded the complete pacification of the Church. It was caused by the action of the supplementary council to the fifth and sixth,—known by the extraordinary title of Quinisext,—in passing some canons obnoxious to the Latin patriarch and, perhaps, enacted almost for the express purpose of humbling his see after the triumph it had won under Agatho. Sergius absolutely refused to affix his name in the place which had been left for it on the paper containing the one hundred and two canons, immediately after the imperial signature and before those of the four Eastern patriarchs. When the protospathary, Zacharias, was bidden to seize the pope and send him to Constantinople, an uprising of the populace reduced that officer to the necessity of seeking protection from the proscribed prelate; and a general revolt drove Justinian, about the same date, into exile. After ten years spent in wandering from tribe to tribe and plotting to regain his lost throne, the mutilated sovereign returned to fulfill the threat he had uttered in an awful hour when his trembling companions besought him to save the ship and propitiate Heaven by forgiving his enemies. Then the tyrant summoned Constantine before him. Well might the Roman patriarch have hesitated to obey. A neighboring prelate, Felix of Ravenna, had been crushed by the fangs of the royal tiger. To have incurred the displeasure of the embittered monarch was to have embraced the rack. Constantine went, looked the savage beast fearlessly in the eye, and returned, not only unscathed, but rewarded with a confirmation of all the privileges of his see. Next ensued a temporary triumph for the heretical faction while the throne was occupied by a fanatical Monothelite, who refused to enter his palace until the picture of the Sixth Council had been torn down. In conformity with a promise he had once made to a hermit who predicted his elevation, this ruler did everything within his power to abrogate that council.

It is at once instructive and distressing to find that a command of Bardanes to subscribe a Monothelite creed was generally obeyed throughout the East; instructive, as indicating that the compromise party was still possessed of some strength; and distressing, as betokening a lamentable lack of fidelity on the part of those who were honestly orthodox in their beliefs. Rome, however, boldly refused to submit, and rose in an outbreak which, but for the interposition of Constantine, would have ripened into a revolt. In less than two years Bardanes Philippicus was hurled from his seat: he pulled down Monothelism with him. John, a most facile prelate, having been forced into the patriarchal throne by Philippicus, and, eager now to secure the favor of a catholic sovereign, Anastasius II., declares that he has always been a true believer at heart, and most submissively entreats to be received into fellowship by the pope. Thus died the heresy of a single will and one operation in our blessed Saviour.

There remained only a small remnant which, entrenched in the fastnesses of Libanus and Anti-Libanus, and revering the abbot Maron as its spiritual father, maintained its independence through the lapse of ages and the crash of governments till the time of the Crusades. In the twelfth century the submission of the Maronites to the Latin patriarch of Constantinople extinguished the last ember of Monothelism.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE ICONOCLASTIC CONTROVERSY.

We have now studied the great controversies which gave rise to the six general councils, and seen the doctrinal system of the Church slowly assuming symmetrical form, as it developed through the strenuous efforts it was obliged to put forth in struggling against different forms of heresy. We have, it is to be hoped, satisfied ourselves that these synods were truly œcumenical, commanding the assent of all Christians to the dogmas propounded by them; and also charged our memories with the substance of their decrees. Thus far the great Catholic Church has, for the most part, maintained its corporate unity, but soon it will snap asunder at a median line marked out by imperialism and betrayed to view by the schisms that have already attracted our attention between the two Romes. As a potent agency in bringing about that lamentable disruption, the long-continued and violent dispute concerning the lawfulness and obligation of worshiping images must now pass in review before us.

Christianity was originally given to a race strongly prejudiced against pictures and images of all kinds. In order to protect the Jews from their inveterate tendency towards the worship of false gods, it had been necessary to prohibit all representations of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth. Yet, that the spirit of Judaism was not hostile to art, is evident from the descriptions which have been preserved of the different places of worship from the portable tabernacle to Herod's gorgeous structure, and from the fact that, when in ancient times a powerful monarch proposed to himself to accomplish a marvel of architecture, his highest aim was to surpass the temple at Jerusalem. Nor can the law against images be literally construed in view of the elaborate carvings which kept before the eye in the pomegranate and the lily emblems of fruitfulness and purity, of the twelve

massive oxen which supported the molten sea of Solomon's temple, and of the cherubim whose wings overshadowed the mercy-seat, all of these ornaments having been carved and fashioned according to directions given by Jehovah Himself. At the dawn of Christianity Pharisaic overstrictness had attached such glosses to the written word that even the most innocent production of artistic skill, however far removed from danger of attracting to itself improper reverence, would not have been tolerated for a moment. The Jews who were early converted to the Gospel retained their ancient repugnance to images of every description, and the proselytes from other religions doubtless felt a strong revulsion against all that savored of the idolatrous practices which they had renounced. The early Church was not inclined to look kindly upon idolatry, or upon anything that would tend in that direction. Having clearly before her eyes in corrupt Corinth, in effeminate and luxurious Ephesus, in profligate Rome, and everywhere in Asia, Syria, Egypt, or Italy, plain proofs of the debasing and debauching influences of heathen rites and polytheistic doctrines, and embarked in a tremendous struggle with the innumerable forms of vice which grew beneath their shade, she was not likely to permit her children to eat the food that had been offered to idols, to bow down before those idols, or even to possess representations of any sort that might lead them back into their former paths. Many of the early Christians were decidedly over-rigid in this matter. The narrow-mindedness of man clings to him even after he has been regenerated, so that some of the greatest and most illustrious of the fathers arrayed themselves against science, and denounced as inventions of the devil theories which are now accepted by all enlightened men, whether believers or unbelievers. What would St. Augustine say, should he now revisit earth and enter a dissecting-room in one of our medical colleges? Would he still denounce, with all the vehemence of his rhetoric, such desecration of the divine image? If he did, his anathemas would provoke a smile among the most reverential. It is a sad truth, the confession of which is being gradually extorted from those who name themselves by the Ever-blessed Name, that the leading minds of the Church have often been bitterly opposed to the progress of thought. There is a certain tendency in elevated piety to look down with pity, if not with contempt, upon what appears to it the trivial affairs of this world. Engrossed with the

contemplation of eternal verities, man scorns the fleeting things of time, sees no importance in the classification of a flower or the computation of the mean distances of the planets; cares naught for an instrument which affords the spectrum of light that emanates from a point no more than forty trillions of miles away, and fails to discover any interest in researches that are revealing the history of our globe for incalculable ages before Adam was created; would prefer that a man should commit all the crimes in the catalogue rather than maintain that the earth is round, that he should mutilate all his brothers and near kinsmen rather than impiously interfere with divine Providence by inoculating for the small-pox, and that he should burn a library rather than invent the printing-press. A similar hostility was displayed against art. Language can be discovered in the ancient Fathers strongly condemnatory of all such trifling as the work of sculptor or painter seemed to their transcendental imaginations. It was by no means the austere Tertullian alone who denounced all adornment or ornamentation as unchristian. But fairness requires that we should ascribe this blind opposition against both science and art, not to religion, least of all to the Christian religion, but to that unfortunate tendency of human nature in its fallen condition which drives it always towards the poles. The corporate Church never committed itself to such a folly, and Christianity was far too grand and broad a faith to fear any kind of truth, or think that its spread could be otherwise than favorable to its own. Christianity hostile to Love of the Beautiful! How can that be when it discloses to our adoring love the compassionate scheme of redemption, when it paints for us the wonderful character of Jesus of Nazareth, when it teaches us how to fill our own lives with the same purity, and righteousness, and loveliness of self-sacrifice which made His the one perfect life that the world will ever have known! Beauty does not belong to the kingdom of darkness and evil: it is a part of the very nature of light and goodness. What is ugly but filth, and foulness, and deceit, and selfishness, and pride? What is beautiful but purity, and cleanliness, and truth, and unselfishness, and humility that imitates the mind of Him who left His own radiant throne in order to take upon Him the form of a servant? Must religion be held to be antagonistic to love of the beautiful because it teaches that beauty of the soul is superior to that which consists in regularity of outline and skillful

blending of colors? Yet this must be the substance of any rational argument against it on that score. How unjust is such an accusation against the religion of Him whose blessed words clothed the lily of the field with additional glory, and in the light of whose Gospel the grass that so soon withers away and is burned mellows into a softer verdancy! Let Manichæism spread its gloomy pall over the fair face of nature, and Montanism mar its beauteous shapes with the ruthless hammer of a repulsive theory, but for the disciple of Christ let all the earth glow with the hope of a coming redemption!

The divinely-implanted sentiment that feeds upon the beautiful forced its way gradually through the obstructions thrown in its path by the circumstances of the primitive Church, and dared at last to claim the right of seeking its appropriate nourishment in the external and sensuous, as well as in the internal and supersensuous, world. This change was inevitable when once the Church had brought to her feet Grecian learning and Grecian genius. Could the countrymen of Phidias and Praxiteles forget the traditions and instincts of twenty generations? The same impulse which had filled the cities of the empire with statues of gods and goddesses, marble embodiments of ideal physical manhood and womanhood, still lived. It may have drawn some sustenance from such relics of ancient art as had lingered behind when heathenism was banished from the basilicas. However that might be, it lived, and was destined to enjoy a period of greater vigor. What power could have withheld the true artist, in whose bosom glowed at once the two fires of genius and devotion, from exerting his talents upon sacred subjects? Was it not inevitable that the first painter of marked ability and genuine piety should give the world a picture of the Baptism, the Last Supper, the Crucifixion, Resurrection, Ascension, of any or all of these? What brush or chisel held by fingers that had handled the Bread of Life could be restrained even by reverence from the impossible attempt of delineating the sacred countenance of Christ? Shall the false and shallow prejudices of the age smother down the aspiring flame? Not so, for there is that in true genius which bursts all trammels, recognizes the truth in the midst of all counterfeits, and dares the worst in behalf of what it feels to be noble, and high, and good. The reverential, loving heart yearns to dedicate its best to the service of its Lord. Has it a remarkable gift, the

ability to do aught better than its fellows, the power of awakening others to higher thoughts, and loftier aspirations, and mightier achievements? It will wish to promote thereby the glory of Him from whom it comes. Can such a wish be wrong? Can it be wrong to make proper use of any capability the Almighty has bestowed upon us? Let the narrowness of bigotry deny to such a spirit the right to follow out the bent of its yearnings, it will, conscious of their derivation from above, indulge them notwithstanding the prohibitory edicts; or else it will turn aside with a groan into other paths, and live a life from which the glory has been stolen. If the Manichæan notion were true that different deities formed the external and the internal, then might a theory be believed which sets the one in antagonism to the other; but as long as man is convinced that the same hand framed the seen and the unseen, the temporal and the abiding, the material and the spiritual, so long will his inmost soul rebel against every theory which forbids it to recognize and admire, not only the good, but the true and the beautiful, wherever found. And if it be right to admire the handiwork of the Creator in mountain, and valley, and stream, in tree, and shrub, and floweret, in the cheerful sunshine, the snow-white cloud-peak, and the brilliant mantle of the evening; if it be right to let the fond eye linger upon the guileless face of innocent childhood, upon the gentle countenance of true womanhood whose purity, and love, and trust envelop it in a radiance before which even its exquisite perfection of outward beauty is forgotten, or upon the robust form and clear-cut features of thorough manhood that delights in toil and danger, that can exchange blow for blow with the strongest and fiercest and yet tame its strength to the tenderness of a mother towards her sick babe; can it be wrong to imitate these on canvas or in marble? Is it wrong to reproduce them in the word-pictures which the glowing imagination of the Oriental orators knew so well how to paint? But perhaps it is only objectionable to set these representations before the eye of the worshiper in the public sanctuary or private shrine, whither he resorts to pay his devotions. Extraordinary idea! Why should all that appeals to the love of the beautiful through the eye be banished from our temples? Is the ear so much more sacred than all the other senses that it alone deserves to be the handmaid of devotion and religious instruction? If those who throng our vast churches are, many of them, too igno-

rant to read or too dull to comprehend what they read, if they can take into their comprehensions and memories at a single glance by means of a pictorial representation scenes, histories, and facts, which otherwise could hardly have been so well impressed upon them by a year's laborious instruction, why should they not be taught by the one method which seems efficacious? If the heart can be assisted in its efforts to rise heavenwards by a massive column or ornate capital, by statue of saint and martyr, or by elaborate design well wrought out in brilliant coloring upon window-glass, wall, or ceiling, why should it be denied such helps? See the inconsistency of the preacher who will summon all the resources of the rhetorical art, and appeal to the imagination with a fervid eloquence which makes it *see* what he holds before it as plainly as though that were actually depicted to the sight,—and will do all this perhaps in a diatribe against embellishment of God's house!

To an educated person there is almost no danger in the utmost profusion of pictures and images. Taught to observe mental processes, and distinguish between the ideal and the real, he is not likely to confound the portrait or the statue with the man of whom it is the representation. With the undisciplined mind it is far different. Just as the savage believes in some mysterious connection between the absent friend and the likeness he holds in his hand, and cannot be persuaded that the latter is not part and parcel of the former, so the unlettered multitude is ready to attach mysterious virtue to the image of a saint, and then to regard it as in some way inhabited by the departed spirit. Nor is the highest talent altogether exempt from the same pernicious tendency. Gazing with intense and lingering love upon the beautiful face of nature, many a man has come to fancy that he held communion with the spirit of the personified material object of his affection; very much as the ancient sage created a nymph to sanction the code of laws over which he had pondered deeply by the bubbling fountain. In the same way, it may not be impossible for the ardent temperament of one who is imbued with the artistic spirit to endow the inanimate stone, or the product of white lead and various pigments, with a fictitious spiritual existence. As long, however, as pictures cover walls and windows merely, and images remain in niches removed from possibility of near approach, their free use is not calculated to prove very harmful. The peril is not

in allowing these representations, but in permitting the performance of adoration before them. The moment a man begins to repeat his prayers before any image or picture, although he may argue that he never had a thought of addressing them to the material substance, and that he uses the representation only to assist his devotion, he is in danger. If the Second Commandment binds the Christian conscience, then is such an act forbidden as idolatrous. The common plea that the worship is paid, not to the idol, but to the deity of which it is a symbol, or of which it serves as a reminder, would excuse all idolatry, since few of the most degraded ever sink so low as to lose all sense of the distinction between the idol and the god. The Almighty will not allow Himself to be confounded, even in the smallest degree, with wood, and stone, and paint, the work of men's hands and the offspring of their petty minds.

Idolatry is, not only an insult to the deity, but an offense against human nature, tending very perceptibly towards the degradation of the race or the individual that indulges in the practice. It enervates, by suffering that exalted faculty of the human mind through which it rises to the contemplation of God to lie comparatively idle. Substituting the bodily eye for that of the soul, it permits the latter to content itself with less exertion than is needed to preserve its healthiness and perfect its powers, and thus weakens it as eyes are always weakened by the use of unnecessary helps, or as the restoration to soundness of an injured leg is impeded by unduly prolonging the use of crutches. A healthy mind, whether of greater or less strength, has no need of any such medium between it and its God as these representations afford, but is perfectly competent, whenever it will undertake the task, to raise itself to such a height that it can adequately realize the presence of God for praying effectually. The effort of doing so is frequently a great one, but is attended with the most beneficial results to the whole mental organism, and is really necessary in order to accomplish the end proposed. The employment of any material object, instead of being a help, is merely a hindrance, causing the mind to stop short of the goal with the belief that it has attained it.

When the spirit of man becomes conscious of growing weakness, it will seek for stimulants which a more vigorous constitution would disdain. The general decay of learning which accompanied

the decline of the empire affected those whose occupation it was to study the mysteries of religion, as well as the scholars of secular knowledge. The decrease of intellectual attainments almost necessarily involves a diminution of mental power, upon the principle that what is treated as useless tends to become so. As the mind ceased to exert its noblest powers in the higher spheres of thought, its tone became insensibly lowered, till presently it shrank from the fatigue of a purely spiritual devotion, and permitted itself to lean more and more upon sensuous helps. Images and pictures would then be multiplied in many churches and introduced into many an oratory, they would be brought down nearer to the worshiper, so as to be kissed and adorned by the more enthusiastic, and would attract towards themselves more and more the feeble-winged supplications of the effeminate multitude, grown too weak for the labor of mounting in thought to the Eternal Throne.

It was inevitable that a reäction would presently take place. Some one would raise the cry of alarm, some bold-spirited monk would issue from the deserts and call mankind in trumpet tones back to the faith from which it had fallen, some high-minded shepherd would fearlessly and unsparingly exert himself to eradicate the harmful practice from his flock, or, under the existing condition of affairs, some pious sovereign would undertake to remind the Church that it was swerving from its allegiance. This movement would, most likely, originate among some hardy and independent race, whose inferior civilization had avoided the fatal rot which was destroying the high, but unchristian, civilization of the Byzantine people: it would perhaps spring from some vigorous tribe of half-wild aborigines, which had preserved among inaccessible cliffs and narrow valleys that valor and fidelity which seem to be imbibed with the bracing atmosphere and extended views of mountainous regions, and for which any kind or degree of refinement whatsoever is but a miserable substitute. Nurtured among rocks and crags, the spirit of Protestantism would only await the signal of destiny to rush down, like one of its own mountain torrents, upon the enervated and luxurious inhabitants of the lowlands. Perhaps, too, the impulse which should set the pent-up stream free would come from outside of the boundaries of Christendom, from this or that false religion to which a justly offended God would give a commission to chastise His own subjects on account of their rebellion.

From the sand wastes of the Arabian peninsula burst a tempest which, in the seventh and eighth centuries, swept like a sirocco over the adjacent countries of the Asiatic continent, and continued its mad career till it was met, in the heart of France, by the still fiercer blasts of the North. In the terrified ear of the Greek rang that tremendous battle-cry, "There is no God but one, and Mahomet is his prophet." Resistless and disdainful, on surged the Saracen hosts, and down went the Greeks before them. With all the emphasis of victory they raised the derisive shout against the *idols* of the Christians, as they called the various images which they found adorning the churches. Then the Jews took up the cry, and nourished their old antipathy to the followers of the despised Nazarene by heaping ridicule upon them as idolaters. May it not have been that Judaism and Mohammedanism thus combined to arouse many a Christian from a lethargy that might have else been fatal? Stung almost into fury by the slanderous epithets lavished upon their brethren, many felt the blush of shame presently supplant the flush of indignation, as the truth slowly dawned upon them that much had been committed to warrant the reproach. Even if the almost universal defense was a denial of the charge, a bold affirmation that the reverence paid to images was not idolatrous, nevertheless the conscience of the Church was, even at that, put upon its guard against possible abuses.

The Isaurian mountains nurtured a race of hardy peasants who did not easily fall a prey to the Saracens after these had overrun Syria. Attracted by such superior facilities as Thrace afforded for the speedy acquisition of wealth, one of these peasants emigrated thitherward, engaged in the profitable business of a grazier, and on one occasion supplied the imperial camp with five hundred sheep. His son enlisted in the guards of Justinian II., and, drawing to himself the favorable regard of his superiors, by his services in the Colchian war especially, rose gradually from the ranks till Anastasius rewarded him with the command of the Anatolian legions. In the year 718 this peasant's son was crowned with the imperial diadem, by the acclaim of the troops, and with the glad approval of the people. Still carrying a soldier's heart, Leo III. drove an army of the Saracens from before the walls of Constantinople, and a Saracen fleet from its harbor, with the assistance of Greek fire, and then pushed those invaders beyond his borders;

and also distinguished himself in various other successful enterprises of a martial nature. Unfortunately, he saw no limits to his authority, but thought himself called upon to rule as absolutely over the minds as over the bodies of his subjects. His remarkable energy and determination made him a terrible persecutor when once he had decided to suppress a sect or put down an evil. In the sixth year of his reign a most ill-advised and cruel edict compelled Jews and Montanists to receive Catholic baptism, with the result that the former submitted to a hollow rite, and the latter perished self-devoted in the flames with which their own fanaticism wrapped their meeting-houses. Although his hatred of Image-worship was not one whit less violent, he wisely dissembled it until ten prosperous years had seated him firmly upon his throne. His first attack was planned with all the prudence of a wily general, who dreads the numbers more than the skill of his foe. Instead of disclosing his full purpose at once, as an ordinary despot would have done, he condescended to employ strategy. He did not aim, he said, at pictures and images themselves, nor even at every species of veneration of them, but only at such adoration as was implied in bowing, kneeling, and prostrating one's self before them: indeed, he professed to entertain such respect for those holy objects that his intention in directing them to be raised above the reach of the people was to protect them from profaning touch of hand or lip. What share the bishop of Nacolia, a Phrygian city, had in this action of the emperor we can only conjecture. It may have been that Constantine was animated by a sincere concern for the honor of Almighty God, burned with vehement indignation at beholding the Church wholly given over, as he may have thought, to idolatrous practices, and hoped to promote the interests of true religion by persuading Leo to emulate the pious zeal of Hezekiah in removing the brazen serpent from the adulterous eyes of backsliding Israel. Both monarch and counselor were probably taken by surprise when the edict was answered in tones of general execration and defiance, and an ill-equipped fleet from the Archipelago proclaimed the indignation of the islanders beneath the walls of the imperial city by supporting the pretensions of a certain Cosmas, who had been put forward by the monkish faction. But Greek fire having again proved an efficient protector of his oft-beleaguered capital, Leo listened to the voice of resentment, and issued a more stringent

edict commanding the demolition of all images and the obliteration of all pictures: those were to be broken to pieces with hammers, these rubbed over with a wet brush.

Such prelates as were themselves opposed to images, or anxious to recommend themselves to imperial favor, proceeded to enforce the edict in their dioceses, and were reïnforced by the secular arm, which ruthlessly punished the refractory by the various methods known to the cruelty of that time. But the opposition was not to be thus easily extinguished. If men had clung tenaciously to an abstruse doctrine concerning the profoundest mysteries, would they easily surrender that upon which their reverential, loving gaze had so often been fastened, that which their very hands had handled? Besides, there were deeper interests than even these involved in this headlong assault upon all kinds of representations; for was not Jesus Christ the *Image* of the invisible God, and therefore was not the very doctrine of the incarnation assailed? It may be that the emperor was performing a most courageous and necessary deed, but he certainly was attempting, almost single-handed, to breast a tremendous tide and turn it back upon itself.

In Germanus, the venerable patriarch of his own city, Leo met with a heavy disappointment, for, holding to that view of the connection between Images and the Incarnation at which we have hinted above, he preferred, although ninety-five years of age, to resign his see rather than subscribe the edict. The example of Constantinople was followed by Rome, which was gradually withdrawing from the decrepid empire of the East, and affiliating itself with the rapidly advancing and consolidating power of the Franks. Gregory II. rejected the edict, with the emphatic approval of all Italy, which seemed ready, if such a step should become necessary in order to save itself from Byzantine despotism, to throw itself at the feet of Luitprand, the Lombard king. Ravenna drove its exarch to Pavia. The whole country was on the verge of revolt. Had Leo attempted to execute his threat of seizing the pontiff, as Martin, of pious memory, had been seized, he would probably have discovered that the pope had not exceeded the bounds of veracity when he wrote that a withdrawal from Rome the distance of twenty-four furlongs, into Campania, would condemn those who should pursue him to the profitless task of chasing the winds. His successor, Gregory III., presided over a

synod of ninety-eight bishops, and united with it in anathematizing all those who opposed Images. This, and other provocations, incensed Leo to such a degree that he sent a fleet to chastise Italy, which, however, escaped at the expense of other countries, the vessels being so badly disabled by storms that they never reached their ultimate destination.

But the most famous champion of images resided within the dominions of the caliph, whose privy counselor he is said to have been, as his father had been before him. John Damascenus has attained the distinction of having been almost the last theologian of the Eastern Church, and of being, to a great extent, the acknowledged exponent of Eastern theology. At the outbreak of this new controversial struggle he wielded the pen in behalf of Images with such effect that, exasperated at the plainness of speech and the force of argument which he presumed to employ, Leo forged a treasonable letter in his handwriting and sent it to the Mussulman. John was evidently a thorough believer in Images. The daily taunts which he must have been compelled to hear at court only served to confirm him in his attachment to his *idols*, if such we choose to term them. He was unable to perceive what hurt such representations of sacred persons, things, or scenes could do to such as had reached the full stature of Christian manhood. Injurious they must have been in the childhood of religion, but they surely could not harm those who lived in the full light of the new revelation. If we can credit tradition, John soon had an opportunity to perform a miracle in attestation of the correctness of his views, for the indignant caliph, disregarding all his protestations of innocence, condemned him to lose the most guilty member. He was fully equal to the occasion. Stooping to a little duplicity, he begged, when evening came, that the hand might be given him, as he experienced great suffering while it was exposed to the open air. His request having been granted, the Damascene presented his petition before the image of the Virgin Mary, and then lay down to rest in the implicit belief that his supplication would be heard in Heaven. When he awoke the next morning the severed wrist was whole again,—unless some mistake has crept into the legend. Rejecting the offer of his former master to reïnstate him in his service, the grateful John dedicated his recovered hand to the cause of images in the monastery of St. Sabbas, near Jerusalem. In three orations which he composed against

Iconoclasm, he makes much of a distinction, which later ages have enlarged upon, between the kind of adoration we pay to the Deity and that worship which we may properly address to creatures, or even to things; a distinction which deserves all the odium that an outraged Christianity can throw upon it.

In 741 Constantine V., surnamed Copronymus, began a reign of such a length that he was enabled, in pursuance of his father's schemes, almost to extirpate Image-worship from the churches. As the repressive measures which he pursued with so much vigor called out many of the most violent passions of men into active play, it was inevitable that very opposite views of his life and character should be presented to posterity by the writers of the period. To the Worshiper of Images he would be a very monster of iniquity, loaded with all the most atrocious and abominable crimes and vices; while to the Iconoclast he was sure to be a pattern of virtue, remarkable for chastity and temperance. The acknowledgment can hardly be withheld that he was endowed with unusual abilities and that he possessed, as might have been expected of his excellent stock, the disposition and the skill to put these to the best account, both in conducting campaigns against Bulgarian and Saracenic enemies, and in increasing the resources of his dominions. It seems more than probable that these valuable qualities of head were joined with gross licentiousness and extreme cruelty, those sad manifestations of a corrupt heart. A rash rebellion, in which the Image-worshipers were more or less implicated, heated into seven-fold fury the furnace to which imperial tyranny doomed them. His brother-in-law, Artavasdus, sought to clothe himself with the purple, and, as a means thereto, courted popular favor by restoring images wherever he obtained power to do so; but was put down after a struggle of three years' duration. Having conquered his rival, Constantine nevertheless thought that prudence required him to place severe restraint upon himself, and postpone the full gratification of his revenge and hatred until he could throw them the reins without imperiling his throne. Proceeding with caution, he fortified himself with the sanction of a council which he convened in the year 754 in the outskirts of Constantinople. This obsequious body was presided over by the bishops of Ephesus and Perga, not a single patriarch being included in its list of three hundred and thirty-eight bishops. Its decisions might have been drawn up by the emperor himself,

so full and explicit were they in condemning images and pictures, which they commanded to be removed from all places of worship, and in anathematizing all who should persist in setting up any such representations, or in adoring them, or even in retaining them in their possession. It is painful to notice, that even this Iconoclastic Council openly declared its approval of the practice of invoking the Virgin and the saints. How lamentable must have been the degeneracy of the Church when both parties could agree in sanctioning so pernicious and irreverent a custom! Verily, it was time that God should arouse Himself, and save the Church from utter apostacy by the lash of bitter adversity.

Constantine went beyond the council, not only ordering that all images should be removed, but that pictures on church walls should be painted over, and thus changed into representations of all sorts of secular scenes. If his design was to goad the people into madness, he could scarcely have devised a better plan, for with what impatience must the devout-minded have seen sacred edifices desecrated with designs taken from the theatre or the circus! If Theodosius of Ephesus and a few others heartily approved of the measures taken for suppressing Images, it is to be feared that a large proportion of both the clergy and laity was even more unalterably hostile, not only to the actual measures, but to all others towards that end. It has always been a characteristic of the monastic life to produce moral courage and religious zeal. Any cause, therefore, which enlists the sympathies of those who have dedicated themselves to prayer and pious meditation, is sure to find abundant martyrs. A fiery monk could at any time be selected who would joyfully embrace a call to penetrate into the palace and upbraid the sternest and cruelest despot to his very face. Peter "the calybite" allowed his fanaticism to carry him before Constantine, and incite him to call that vindictive man by names that must have irritated a much less passionate one: he atoned for his rashness beneath the lash, being scourged in the hippodrome and afterwards strangled. Nothing could subdue the constancy of such men as Stephen of Bithynia. Monks flocked in such large numbers to his grotto, which was on a lofty mountain near the sea-shore, to receive counsel and encouragement from this ardent Image-worshiper, that policy dictated an attempt to win him over by means of an embassage undertaken by a person of high rank. This conciliatory policy having failed, recourse was had to

the customary measures of imprisonment, banishment, and torture, but with equal lack of success. So little impression was made upon his dauntless mind, that he actually dared to trample upon the emperor's likeness before his very eyes. Taking a coin and drawing attention to the *image* on it, he threw it to the ground and put his foot upon it. The illustration was extremely forcible, but neither courteous nor safe. The emperor's indignation was, as might have been anticipated, too strong for his love of consistency, and prevented him from learning the lesson of, at least, proceeding against Images in such a way as not to insult the One for whose honor he professed to be concerned. Stephen expiated his offense upon the stones of the streets, being dragged about by one foot till the breath had left his aged body, which was then torn in pieces. Such unflinching firmness convinced Copronymus that the only sure method of overcoming the resistance of the monks would be to break up their communities and abolish their orders. With that end in view he destroyed monasteries or profaned them by consigning them to secular uses, and compelled their inmates to break their most solemn vows by eating luxuriously and by standing in the hippodrome hand-in-hand with lewd women. The refractory were subjected to the usual penalties. The barbarous name of a Thracian governor, Michael Lachanadraco, is especially infamous in this connection. Not satisfied with putting out the eyes of those who refused to commit perjury by wearing white and taking wives, nor with banishing them to Cyprus, he adopted the devilish device of anointing their heads with a combustible mixture and then igniting it, slew many, and burned and plundered the monasteries generally. His rage against relics emptied the celebrated Chalcedonian Church of those of St. Euphemia, which were cast into the sea and carried by the waves, it is said, giving forth a delightful odor all the way, to Lemnos, and there preserved for the faithful of a happier generation.

Every outrage was heaped upon one of these unhappy men, whom the emperor's own partiality had created patriarch of Constantinople. Why the arrow of persecution was aimed at him is hidden in obscurity. Recommended in the first place by his zeal against Images, and readily compliant with later commands of his master, who required his presence at banquets and indecent scenes which he could not attend without breach of his monastic vows,

Constantine nevertheless fell at length under the imperial displeasure, and was banished, only to be brought back again before the second year had expired and subjected to every indignity and cruelty. Beaten, struck, spitted upon, compelled to ride backwards upon an ass, holding its tail with both hands, his hair, eyebrows, and beard having been plucked out, thrown violently to the ground, trampled upon, and at length beheaded, the poor sufferer doubtless had ample opportunity to sigh over the sinful complaisance, which had shorn him of his dignity in the eyes of others, and deprived him of the satisfaction he might have felt in enduring persecution had not his own weakness deserved it.

Images continued under the ban during the short reign of the third emperor of this line, Leo IV., who, however, pursued a much more lenient course towards the worshipers of them than his father had done. Being endowed with little strength of constitution or force of character, he fell much under the sway of his wife, but not so utterly as to permit her to indulge her fondness for Images. The violent repressive measures of three sovereigns were not without some effect in uprooting Image-worship. Two important classes at least were rendered thoroughly Iconoclastic. The episcopal thrones, being very largely under imperial control, were, of course, filled, as they became vacant, with such ecclesiastics as were of one mind with the court upon the great subject of controversy. However, the bishops were, in all probability, more unanimously Iconoclastic when Leo IV. ascended the throne than they were after his wife had secretly been using her influence during four years and a half in procuring the promotion of monks to such seats as were to be filled. The second class was one of enormous power in all absolute governments. The military achievements of Constantine Copronymus had attached the soldiery so firmly to his memory, that nothing but superior prowess in any of his successors could have induced them to look kindly upon a cause that he had assailed so vehemently. On the opposite side were, first of all, the much-enduring, but unconquerable, bands of monks, men who almost seemed to enjoy the persecutions which they courted. Then, behind these pioneers stood the vast masses of the populace, rank upon rank, always disposed to attach great sanctity to the monastic habit, and of late deeply impressed and entirely won over by the constancy and courage that had so conspicuously marked these separatists from society. It was evident

that the battle was not yet decided, and that the Image-worshipers only awaited a leader in order to display their forces upon a well-contested field. As the impulse which had overturned the idols had come from a hardy, independent, plebeian stock, impatient of all that savored of effeminacy, so it was likely that the reäction would spring from an ancestry that had lost in many generations of high culture that freedom of thought and nobility of nature which can seldom survive long contact with luxury. In marrying his son to a woman who, besides being a Greek, was of a family noted for its attachment to Image-worship, Copronymus made the strange mistake of supposing that a solemn oath could bind her conscience to inaction in so holy a cause. Educated under the effete civilization of later Greece, and immoral to such a degree as to crave instinctively some kind of religion which concealed sin under the veil of external and sentimental observances, Irene was just the woman to become the heroine of the monkish party and restore Images to the niches from which they had been so ignominiously expelled.

After the death of her husband Irene grasped the reins of government in the name of her son, Constantine VI., a boy about ten years old, and began at once to disclose an intention of reïnstating both monks and images. At first she contented herself with what to her was a half-way measure, an edict of general toleration. Her especial care for several years was to prepare the way for a total revolution by accustoming the people to the sight of the banished monks, by favoring the monastic life, and by promoting as many ascetics as she could without creating too much disturbance. A fortunate incident aided her schemes when they were becoming ripe. In 784 a severe sickness induced Paul to abdicate the patriarchate of Constantinople, and take refuge in a monastery; in which he soon afterwards expired, but not until he had expressed deep contrition for all that he had done in opposition to the sacred cause of Images, declared that it had been done out of regard for man and at the price of an uneasy conscience, indicated a desire to perform penance as the motive of his retirement, and advised the empress to appoint as his successor some worthy man who should reconcile his see to the rest of the Church by reëstablishing the blessed custom of worshiping Images. So opportune was this occurrence that it has very much the look of a gotten-up affair; and yet, as has been suggested, it would be natural enough

for a man to act as Paul did, provided he had originally been an Image-worshiper in sentiment, and, in joining the iconoclasts, had done violence to his convictions from a desire to conciliate the emperor. Pains were not spared to circulate this story, and Tarasius, the first secretary of state, having been recommended by the dying patriarch, was irregularly advanced to the episcopal throne. As an off-set to the council which had condemned images under Copronymus, one was now summoned by Irene. But with all her caution, she had outrun prudence, for when, in August of the year 786, a number of bishops had assembled in the Byzantine church of the Apostles, a mob broke in upon them and compelled them to disperse. Perceiving that a large number of the prelates were violent Iconoclasts, and that they could rely upon the support of the soldiery, the empress wisely bent to the gale, and directed her adherents to withdraw. The interval of a year having sufficed to dispatch the unruly guard away from the city, break it up, and form a new one, and to complete other necessary preparations, the fathers met again the ensuing September. Nice was preferred to Constantinople for the place of assembling, as being freer from disturbing elements and redolent with the sacred memories of the year 325. The three hundred and fifty members of this synod were presided over by the Roman envoys, Tarasius, and two monks who claimed to represent the three remaining patriarchs. The history of the proceedings is nauseous to all who have not lost the power of feeling moral disgust, as it is impossible to suppose that the lapse of the Iconoclastic bishops was a genuine conversion, and we must regard it as a most sickening exhibition of Oriental fickleness and spiritual cowardice. It is pitiful to hear man after man sounding the note of abject submission, to listen to Gregory of Neo-Cæsarea while he begs to know what is the general opinion of the conclave before venturing to form one of his own, or to notice the wretched spirit with which they seek to excuse themselves for their former conduct. What sort of men to lead the armies of the Lord are these? one involuntarily exclaims, as he searches in vain for a single dignitary who dared to stand by his convictions, or indeed who seems to have really had any convictions. Better even could we return to the days of Cyril and Dioscorus, than that we should linger among these galvanized corpses, these hollow shells, of men! Worse than the contentions of John and Cyril, worse than the tumultuous cries

which drowned the voice of Theodoret, worse than the Latrocinium itself with its brutal assaults upon Flavian, worse by far than any exhibition of zeal however uncontroled or of fanaticism however wild, was the awful stupor of death which flung the Second Council of Nice upon the pavement before an Image, and reminds us sadly of that terrible scene in the Hell of the poet, when the congregated potentates suddenly find themselves prone upon the earth, hissing with forked tongue and impotent rage. The council decreed that *flat* Images (representations made by the painter's, and not the sculptor's, art) should be set up and honored with a certain kind of worship less profound than that paid to the Deity. This decree, having been signed by the members of the council and by the empress and her son, fastened the two distinctions upon the Eastern Church for more than a thousand years, and, it may be, for a much longer period yet to come. The Second Council of Nice was intended to be œcumenical, and is considered by the East to have merited that appellation; but we will discover enough in the sequel of its history to convince us that no universal confirmation of its decisions ever occurred to entitle it to such honor. Throughout the extent of the Greek empire its authority was indeed acknowledged during the rest of Irene's reign and several subsequent ones, but even there it did not pass altogether unquestioned.

In the year 813 another Leo came to the rescue of a pure and manly faith. The days of the Isaurian were almost restored under the Armenian, who was not unlike, in most respects, to that famous namesake whom he seems to have chosen as his pattern. Bred in the camp, Leo V. retained under the purple the virtues of a warrior, and the cruelty and arbitrariness which often disgrace his profession. Most strange to relate, the impetus in this instance came from a monk, who promised the ruler a long and prosperous reign if he would exert himself to eradicate idols and idolatry from the Church. Determined to assure himself of his road before advancing, he consulted with Nicephorus, patriarch of the city, the celebrated monk and fanatical image-worshiper, Theodore Studites, and others who were of that side, and with Antony of Sylæum and other Iconoclasts. His first public step was to require the adherents of the Images to promise that they would abstain from holding meetings and from discussing the topics under dispute. Vehement in a bad cause, Theodore threw all the fanaticism of a

monk into the opposite scale, with the result that he exasperated the emperor both against himself and his party, so that orders were issued to destroy or remove Images wherever it could be done, and many recalcitrant prelates and abbots were deprived and banished, and he himself sent into exile. During the seven years that saw him driven from place to place, starved, imprisoned, dreadfully scourged, and otherwise maltreated to the extreme of human endurance, Theodore evinced a heroism which causes a sigh that it was manifested, not only in behalf of a more than doubtful practice, but needlessly, since he could have avoided his sufferings by using mildness and moderation, instead of untempered boldness, in his speech. He particularly offended the emperor by his reply when summoned to attend a synod which was held by the successor of Nicephorus with a view to overturning the council of Irene and reëstablishing that of Copronymus. Stung by the opposition he encountered, and not least by Paschal's refusal to receive the imperial commissioners into Rome, by his undertaking to intercede for the advocates of pictures, and by his general attitude towards the iconoclasts, Leo's Armenian blood grew warmer by degrees, till his rage broke forth in terrible and vindictive measures, that threatened to overwhelm the pictures and their friends in one indiscriminate ruin.

The next emperor, Michael II., or "the Stammerer," leaped, in 820, on Christmas day, from a dungeon to the throne, over the dead body of the Armenian, and with such rapidity that he wore his fetters several hours after his elevation. He began by tolerating images, and might have continued in that course had not the frantic Theodore persisted in irritating him, till he was driven into forbidding them and punishing their worshipers. An Iconoclast ruled the Byzantine Church, during this reign, in the person of Antony of Sylæum. It appears, from a letter which Michael sent to the Frank emperor, Lewis the Pious, that the extravagances of the Image-worshipers had exceeded all bounds. Images had been employed as sponsors for children: now they were offered lights, and incense, and the shorn locks of devotees, and were used as media for conveying the consecrated bread to communicants; while pictures were made to serve as altars, and even the excess was reached of scraping off the paint from them and mixing it with the wine in the chalice.

Having been educated by John the Grammarian, whom he

soon raised to the patriarchate, Theophilus was something of a scholar, very much of a pedant, and not at all favorable to pictures. He strove to abolish the practice of adoring these by raging against artists and monks in general, and on one occasion condemned two brothers, Theophanes, the poet, and Theodore, to receive two hundred lashes, and have twelve iambic verses of his own composition branded on their foreheads, because they would not yield to him the palm of controversy. His indignation fell upon another monk, named Lazarus, who, however, persevered in using his brush, notwithstanding admonitions and cruel beatings, till he had achieved a picture which obtained a reputation for possessing miraculous powers. Having slain his brother-in-law, Theophobus, lest he should disturb the succession, and bound his wife and the senate by an oath to preserve the course of ecclesiastical policy which he himself had adopted, he expired in 842.

A second Irene was now to appear upon the stage. Like that empress-mother, sprung of an image-worshiping family, and, like her, bound by a solemn engagement not to impose the practice upon her dominions or even to indulge in it herself, Theodora imitated the conduct of her predecessor in disregarding her promise, and in laboring with patience and astuteness to establish the adoration of pictures upon an immovable basis. One of the guardians of her minor son was a decided advocate of Images, but Manuel, his uncle, was restrained by prudential considerations from declaring his sentiments very explicitly till after a dangerous sickness, from which several monks had promised him a complete recovery upon condition of his pledging himself to labor for the restoration of pictures. Theodora herself had a difficulty to overcome in her reluctance to cast any aspersions upon the memory of her husband. Her scruples being finally removed, the necessary measures were resolved upon to reïnstate Images in their full glory. The patriarch John having been ejected with violence, and Methodius, a confessor in the cause of pictures, thrust in his place, and a synod having pronounced in favor of what some insisted upon calling *idolatry*, the dethroned Images of the capital were replaced with great pomp on the First Sunday in Lent, a day which has ever since been observed in the Oriental Church under the name of the Feast of Orthodoxy; and Images had again and finally triumphed through the instrumentality of a woman.

Rome had all along been the most unflinching patron of Images, but her example had had little weight outside of Italy. In the West a new power was rising, which would soon wrest the Eternal City from the Byzantine sceptre. The Merovingian dynasty had been gradually obscured by the mayors of the palace, till at last Childeric was immured in a monastery and his officer, Pepin the Little, grandson of Pepin of Heristal, and son of Charles Martel, formally seated upon the throne. After acquiring from the sacred hands of Pope Stephen such additional title as he could convey, and reigning with renown for sixteen years, Pepin divided the rapidly consolidating empire of the Franks between his two sons, of whom the one, Charlemagne, soon heard himself declared sole and undisputed ruler. The great abilities of this man and the long continuance of his rule enabled him vastly to enlarge the boundaries of his dominions, by subduing the Saxon tribes and hurling Desiderius from the Lombard throne, and to improve the mode of administering the government, increase the internal resources, and promote the interests of learning and religion. Possessed of great natural shrewdness, of an excellent understanding, and of marvelous energy, Charlemagne distinguished himself almost as much in letters as in arms and political affairs. Although of gigantic stature and herculean strength, his moral qualities corresponded with the physical. Submitting to receive the crown of the Roman empire from Leo III., he was, nevertheless, not the man to be restrained by deference to any one from investigating independently any subject that demanded careful examination, or from adhering firmly to the opinion he should be led to form, and freely advocating what he had concluded to be the correct view. Therefore, when the controversy about Images came up before him, he felt no awe of emperor or pontiff, borrowed his arguments neither from Constantinople nor Rome, but called his ecclesiastics, at the head of whom was Alcuin, around him, and with their help gave to the world a full and clear statement of his belief with regard to the topic under dispute in "The Four Caroline Books." Having to contend against hereditary and gross idolatry in those barbarians whom he baptized by thousands at the edge of the battle-axe, he was not likely to look with great favor upon any practice that seemed to ape their degrading superstition. Besides which he was doubtless incensed against Irene, on account of the slight she put upon

him by refusing to fulfill a contract of marriage between her son Constantine and his daughter Rothrud.

Both parties had run to extremes, after the usual fashion of disputants. On the one hand, the advocates of Image-worship had gone such lengths that, although in theory they preserved various nice distinctions which protected them from the guilt of intentionally transgressing the Second Commandment, in practice they certainly infringed upon the forbidden territory. Indeed, we may make a bold advance and say that their whole teaching was tinctured through and through with idolatry, that the entire drift of the current was carrying them in that direction, and that their position was utterly untenable except by employment of defenses subversive of Christianity. The same plea which they were so fond of advancing would justify every prostration ever made, unless we can suppose men so besotted in their crass ignorance as to confound a horrid, grimacing, shapeless lump of stone with the immaterial deity their souls crave to know and address. On the other hand, the Iconoclasts had permitted themselves to indulge in some very ridiculous assaults upon art. If a less fatal error than the other, this was by no means without injurious results. It is no slight mistake to dry up any fountain of happiness that the Creator has caused to bubble forth in the human bosom, to rob mankind of any innocent pleasure, or throw down any ladder by which he can climb nearer to heaven. It is a terrible crime to force into the ranks of her enemies any who could be faithful and useful servants of the Church, as those were attempting to do who put forth such zealous efforts to drive art, and all who loved it, from within the sacred precincts. Idolatry may be worse than barrenness, coarseness, and ugliness, but these last are bad enough if they repel from her communion those who, knowing that the love of the beautiful is a gift of God, shrink from a creed which surrenders it to the devil and dooms to starvation those minds that are cast in the artistic mould.

It is greatly to the credit of the Western emperor that he had the wisdom to steer a middle course, avoiding the rocks and shoals which lay on either side of the deep, but narrow, channel; neither offering insults to Infinite Power by bowing in adoration before a mere representation as though it were divine, nor striving to root out any divinely-implanted instincts from the human breast. In his elaborate work, Charlemagne does not hesitate to criticise

freely both the Image-worshipers and their adversaries, administering, however, the severest rebuke to that party which, by introducing objectionable and dangerous practices into the Church, had made itself responsible for the whole disturbance. Nothing in it is more noteworthy, perhaps, than his treatment of the argument which had been drawn from the custom of prostration before images of the emperor. He reasons that nothing is gained by founding one bad practice upon another, and especially when that other is a mere remnant of the ancient pagan idolatry. How refreshing is such language after breathing the stifling air of the Byzantine court! Pope Adrian I.'s weak reply failed even to shake the shield of his mighty adversary, who sat not less firmly upon the steed of theological controversy than he did upon the strong and spirited charger which was accustomed to bear his vast bulk through dismayed multitudes on the banks of the Weser and the Elbe. The views which had been so powerfully advocated by their sovereign were thoroughly approved by the Estates of the realm when they assembled, in 794, at Frankfort-on-the-Main, to consult about affairs both civil and ecclesiastical. Whatever had been the decision of the former council, held under Pepin, at Gentilly, no doubt envelops the attitude of this noted assembly towards Image-worship. The worst charge that can be laid at its feet is that of having unjustly accused the second council of Nice with having assigned the same kind of worship to pictures that is due to the ever-blessed Trinity; whereas it had distinctly asserted the contrary,—although the imperfect reports of its acts which had reached Frankfort might not have been explicit upon this point.

Similar views were advanced by a council which met in Paris in 825, having been convoked by Lewis the Pious on occasion of the embassy sent to him by Michael the Stammerer, begging that he would use his influence to obtain the Pope's sanction of the proceedings against Image-worship. This synod rejected Adrian's letter, with some tenderness for that prelate's reputation, and approved of the retention of Images and their employment as helps to the memory, understanding, and imagination, but reprobated the use of them as stimulants to devotion by repeating one's prayers before them. The emperor and the council both attempted to reconcile Pope Eugenius and Michael, but did not meet with much success. Still, the flattering regard they showed for the

papal chair won upon its occupant so far as to remove any disposition he may have had to adopt harsh measures against his Frankish allies. As for the two emperors, they seem to have been in entire sympathy with each other, Michael not being at all a violent Iconoclast. Certain prelates, especially Agobard, archbishop of Lyons, and Claudius, bishop of Turin, wrote in favor of a total abolition of pictures, or even strove to banish them from the churches under their jurisdiction by forcible ejectment; but the general sentiment of the empire was on the side of moderation.

France by no means stood alone in her refusal to accept the Romish doctrine of Image-worship. Britain, in particular, showed no hesitation in following her example, and may have even united formally with Charlemagne and the council of Frankfort in their decisions. Indeed the entire West, with the exception of Italy, set its face like a flint against the fatal decrees of the second Nicene synod.

Unfortunately, this bright scene soon becomes overcast, as the dense vapor of papal corruption spreads upon the fair face of Europe; but through it all shines down to our day bright rays from the beacon-light which Frankfort erected upon such a well-chosen site.

CHAPTER XV.

THE SCHISM OF THE EAST AND WEST.

Although the Creator had designed that all men should, as far as possible, live amicably together, the wicked folly of the tower-builders made it necessary for Him to confound their language and disperse them over the face of the earth. Unity is a most desirable condition, but one for which it is not wise to sacrifice everything else, especially since all that can be bought is the mere shadow, the substance being of too precious a nature ever to be exposed in the market. Of what value is outward harmony when deep beneath the surface rankle envy, jealousy, and hate? We have arrived at a period in church history when the scene of Babel was reënacted upon a wider theatre, God once more descending to scatter those who were plotting against His supremacy.

It becomes necessary for us to survey the subject of church authority in matters of doctrine from a different standpoint. We have accepted the theory that the decree of a General Council, when it has once been ratified by a large majority of the national and provincial churches, is to be received with unquestioning submission, on the ground that it has then become an authoritative utterance of that Church to which was promised the Holy Spirit's infallible guidance. At the same time it must be apparent to all who will be at the pains of thinking about the matter, that there is no guarantee, other than our Lord's covenant, that, not only a large proportion, but the whole mass, of the Church would not lapse into error. If that body contained none but good and sincere men, and if good and sincere men always held the truth, then the conclusion that the voice of the Church must be the voice of God would be irrefragable; but, unfortunately, the fold contains many wolves in sheep's clothing, and the sheep themselves often straggle away into the wastes of heresy; and therefore the assurance which we sought has evaded our grasp. There is no inherent

infallibility in the Church; nor is there anything in Scripture to forbid our believing that a very large majority of her members has, at certain periods, departed from the true standard both in faith and morals. It is true that there are those promises upon which we have built our theory of general councils, but we are not permitted to interpret those blessed and comforting words *à priori*. What Christ's exact meaning was in uttering them we can safely decide only by studying their fulfillment in church history, since otherwise we would expose ourselves to perils as imminent as those of the rash individual who ventures to dogmatize about the exposition of prophecy before the happening of the events predicted. After the progress of time has brought about the events, then we can look back and wonderingly trace out their entire correspondence with the prophecy: so, as the scroll of ecclesiastical history slowly unrolls itself before us, we gradually ascertain, with some degree of exactness, what the promise that it should be guided into all truth signified. The words themselves justified our looking for some kind of divine direction and control: more than this, they enabled us to form hypotheses which we could verify by reference to the transactions, or resolved themselves into tests by which we could try hypotheses framed from these transactions. By such means we arrived at the theory that the method by which the mind of the Spirit was to be ascertained, consists in assembling a council, and sending down its decrees to the various churches, to be finally approved or rejected by them. If, therefore, we understand aright the promise of the Church's great Head, and are not mistaken in laying down the two requisites of *conciliar action* and *universal ratification*, no decree of a council is binding unless sanctioned by the popular voice, and, on the other hand, no opinion, however widely it may seem to be held, involves the Church's credit until it has been definitely and formally promulgated by a recognized deliberative body of that vast corporation.

Had the Church preserved its unity much beyond the period at which we have paused to glance around us and take the bearings of certain points, we can hardly doubt that erroneous dogmas would have been saddled upon it. In order to avert so dire a calamity, Providence made the assembling of a general council impossible, by ordering that just at that juncture the forces of disruption should overcome the power of adhesion which had so long

kept them under restraint, and permanently divide the organization into two nearly equal portions. Or, if any one objects to the use of phraseology which seems to make the All-good, even remotely, responsible for an evil, let us say that, when God appointed general councils to be the means by which He would fence in revealed truth with authoritative formulæ, He foresaw that as soon as they should threaten to become instrumental in destroying the faith, the wickedness of man would culminate in a catastrophe which would render it thenceforth impossible to hold such a synod. But, it will be demanded, if the Church was split into halves, must not one of these have ceased to be the Church, for otherwise there would no longer have been *one* body of Christ, since two would have equal claim to the title and honor? Is such reasoning, we would reply, very cogent? When a family quarrel becomes so violent that, like Lot and Abraham, the members are obliged to share the land between them, do they cease to be the children of one common ancestor, lose the features and traits of character which are derived from that source, and forfeit their titles to the inheritance? We are very much disposed to think that there are ties which survive any loss of external unity. Divide the Anglo-Saxon race into a dozen nations, and it would still be the same indomitable, enterprising, all-subduing race. So with the Church of God: it has a unity which very severe rending fails to destroy. But this notion of an internal and inseverable bond belongs to the theory of an invisible church, and is altogether out of place in a theory built upon the doctrine of a regularly-incorporated body! Not so, unless to insist that man has a body amounts to a denial that he has a soul. We do not believe in invisible families, nor in invisible nations or races, though we do think that all these are held together, to a very great extent, by ligaments that the senses could never discover. The outward, visible union of the corporation ecclesiastical was lost, but the inner remained without experiencing serious disturbance. The mutual excommunication of the two Romes was as though Jacob and Esau had continued to reside under their father's roof, each refusing to converse with the other and going the length of proclaiming that his brother had forfeited his birthright, and yet both still partaking of Isaac's food and enjoying all the privileges of sons. Such dissensions are most deplorable, but do not interfere with the title of an innocent, or of an offending, child to the pre-

rogatives of sonship, until the parent takes the side of one faction and drives the other from his hearth. It was a sad day for Christianity which saw East and West committed to perpetual hostility; and yet both sections preserved the creeds and the dogmatic faith of the undivided Church, retained a valid ministry, and adhered to lawful and sufficient methods of administering the sacraments; nor did they intentionally sever themselves from the communion of the faithful. If Rome was in the right, Constantinople honestly thought the contrary. If both were about equally culpable, then it is hard to say that either excommunicated herself from the Catholic Church by withdrawing from the fellowship of the other. In His garden God had planted a tender shoot, which had grown upwards and spread outwards, until its magnificence was unsurpassed by the stateliest cedar of Lebanon, and its pride threatened to poison the currents of its life and convert its smooth-cheeked and luscious fruit into apples of Sodom. Down shot the bolt of righteous retribution, smiting fair upon the heart of the tree and splitting it asunder to the very roots. Eastward and westward bent the two halves, looking persistently away from each other, till they had grown apart and almost succeeded in themselves forgetting, and in causing others to forget, that one common life flowed, with the sap, from common roots to the outmost extremities of both. Though less strong to resist the hurricane's blast, and far less imposing than if symmetrical branches had continued to spring gracefully from all sides of a single upright and massive trunk, the tree was still in reality but one tree, the very one which the Divine Hand had put into the ground and the Divine care had nurtured through all the years, growing and flourishing by the life its planter had infused into it, presenting the aspect of two separate stocks, and yet united indissolubly beneath the surface in a matted system of roots which, drawing nourishment from a light, porous, and rich soil, brought all their tributaries into one grand stream, before sending their supplies up through the rival trunks.

The tree may not be killed by a stroke that splits it from top to bottom, but it must be seriously injured. How much of its strength must be expended in repairing loss and healing wounds! How much, too, has its permanent value been diminished! And who can calculate the amount of detriment which accrued to the Church Catholic from the Great Schism? What immense injury

has been done to religion by the unedifying spectacle of the two halves of the Christian Church fulminating anathemas at each other through centuries of discord! How have the minds of sincere inquirers been perplexed by the contradictory claims advanced by the two sections! What waste of force has resulted from the directing against each other of efforts that ought to have been leveled against sin and heathenism! And the Church drew down upon itself the bolt that so nearly crushed it. Of all offenses against the Supreme Ruler of the world, that must be the most hateful to Him which amounts to a denial of His sovereignty or to a direct rejection of it; and especially must this be true in the case of the Church, which He has purchased with His own blood, and over which He reigns with a peculiarly loving care. The great crime of ancient Israel, the one which first divided it into two kingdoms and then drove the various tribes into captivity and dispersion, was that of unfaithfulness to Jehovah in the forsaking of His altars for those of Baal, Ashtaroth, Moloch, and Milcom. The first act of apostasy on the part of the Spiritual Israel was when it stooped to kiss the feet of Constantine the Great, seeking the support of a despot's arm, in apparent distrust of that mighty hand which had so often scattered its enemies before it. A second and worse act occurred when, at the beck of Irene, the Second Council of Nice turned, as it were, its back upon the Mercy-seat, and fell prone to earth before the rising sun of Image-worship. Could God smile upon such rebellion? He could not, but scourged His revolted subjects terribly by the rod of the Arabian impostor, whose frantic hordes burst almost literally from the bottomless pit, and carried devastation with them over the fairest portions of Asia and Africa, not to say Europe, like the locust-swarms of the desert; and finally lighted up the murky heavens with one flash of righteous indignation, while the lightning sped upon its errand of disruption. If man *will* fight against God, then ought he to expect that God will presently fight against him, and overwhelm him with a swift destruction.

Yet natural causes did not fail to operate and produce their due results. The union of Church and State inevitably involved the one, more or less, in all the vicissitudes of the other. If the Church Catholic allowed itself to become identified with the Roman empire, whatever affected the latter must affect the former. The enemies of Rome would look with disfavor upon

the Church established in her realms. We cannot have failed to notice how the quarrels of rival emperors were accompanied by disputes between the leading prelates of their respective dominions. Still, the conservative principle was incomparably stronger in the religious than in the civil corporation, as is proved by the multiplicity of the convulsions through which the empire had passed before the two patriarchs found in Zeno's unfortunate Henoticon a barrier sufficient to hold them apart for thirty-five years. Eight years previous to Felix's withdrawal of his see from the Byzantine communion, the last emperor of the West had dropped from his feeble grasp the sceptre which had passed into the hands of Honorius when the final division took place upon the death of Theodosius. Had the Church not weakened itself by getting into a false position, what a strong band might it not have been to bind together the fragments of the once glorious empire of the Cæsars! Would not the entire course of history have been far different had it only been true to itself, and put its whole reliance upon the Lord God of Hosts, instead of entering into forbidden alliances with worldly powers? But having once seated herself in the gilded chair of servitude at the invitation of Constantine, the Church could not easily rise and choose another. From that time onwards she was in a great measure identified with her master, but yet displayed, to the very end of the tragedy, a marvelous tenacity of adhesion, only yielding to the disruptive agencies when her patience had been worn out by repeated failures in her efforts to preserve peace within her own borders, and not till long after the Franks had finally detached Italy from the Greek empire, which was then waning rapidly.

A dominion which reached over large portions of three continents was too vast to be enduring. In the mighty empire of Augustus and his successors, the line of cleavage was indicated by the seam of contact between the two civilizations which had sprung from the two famous peninsulas of Southern Europe. In the progress of centuries repeated blows upon the seam produced their proper result, and the Church fell asunder, likewise, as soon as the force of disruption had time to work upon it. The real causes, therefore, of the separation between Rome and Constantinople were political. Yet there were not wanting such minor causes as lay in subjects of controversy which could easily have reached an amicable settlement had it not been for the major ones

which lay behind and pushed the others forward. Among these secondary agencies, the iconoclastic controversy was not without its influence, but far more important in prolonging, if not in creating, the breach was a dispute which turned upon the right of the Latins to insert a clause in the creed of the general councils. We have purposely omitted to mention the arrogance of the Roman pontiff as a cause of disunion, not because we are not disposed to allow it great importance, but because we consider it in the main a political one, inasmuch as the rise of the papacy was due to the connection of the church with the state, and in the absence of that unfortunate relation never could have taken place.

The Visigoths, the barbarians who conquered Spain, long refused to accept the decrees of Nicæa. At length Hermenegild, converted from Arianism by the noble constancy to her faith of the Merovingian princess whom he had married, refused to dishonor himself by a repudiation of his real sentiments, and, after several unsuccessful attempts against his father's throne, was reluctantly sentenced by him to receive the usual punishment of treason. The faith of Hermenegild and his fair spouse Ingultdis was professed by his younger brother Recared, who, upon obtaining the sceptre, proceeded, with great wisdom and moderation, to bring his people over to the same profession, and in 589 held a provincial synod of seventy bishops at Toledo. This assembly undertook the dangerous and unwarrantable task of adding to the Nicene Creed,—that formula which had been set forth at the first general council, slightly enlarged by the second, and in the form it then assumed ratified by three later ones, and, at least implicitly, by a fourth,—that formula which was fenced around by the decrees of six assemblies received as œcumenical by the whole of Christendom,—that formula which had been hallowed by the devoted attachment and loyal support of saints and martyrs from Athanasius and Hilary of Poictiers, from Gregory Nazienzen and Theodoret, to Pontianus and Reparatus, to Maximus and Martin, —of adding to that venerable and sacred Creed a few words which were thought to be required by the immediate emergency. Strange that a small gathering of bishops from a single province should think itself competent to manufacture a better creed than the whole Christian Church had made! The Fathers, of 381, had said of God the Holy Ghost that He proceedeth from the Father,

but this did not satisfy the Spaniards. They thought that due regard for the honor of the Son required the addition of such words as would declare that the Spirit emanates also from Him, and so made the sentence run, "Who proceedeth from the Father *and the Son*," the added clause, in the Latin tongue, being "*Filioque*." This innovation maintained its ground, spread into France, and was gradually adopted by the whole Western Church, but was received with an outcry by the Orientals, and denounced for at least two weighty reasons.

In the first place, the Greeks objected to the clause as an unauthorized addition. It is true that great liberty of creed-making was permitted in the early church, but this had been curtailed by the œcumenical councils. There is no evident impropriety in the establishment by universal consent of one carefully drawn formula as a symbol of faith for the entire body, the confession of which shall entitle any member of the church to communion everywhere; and when such a step had been taken, no church that should presume to alter that creed could shelter itself behind the quibble that great latitude had been allowed in the apostolic age. If the collective body was not competent to issue a symbol which no individual and no particular church would have any right to change in the smallest degree, then we must think that its pretension to be an organized society was one of the merest shams that were ever invented. Now, that the *Filioque* clause was not contained in the original creed is beyond question. The Latin patriarch himself is on record against it, in a somewhat remarkable manner. A complaint having been brought before the synod of Aix, in 809, that certain Frankish pilgrims had been harshly treated in Jerusalem on account of this addition to the creed, and the assembly having ranged itself on the side of their countrymen, Charlemagne laid the matter before the pope, whereupon Leo, although declaring himself a believer in the Double Procession, pronounced against the unauthorized insertion of the Clause, and had the Creed engraved in Greek and Latin on two silver shields, without the Filioque, and set up in St. Peter's.

The opposition of the Greeks did not rest wholly upon formal grounds, but extended to the doctrine expressed, which, they contended, was subversive of the Father's Monarchy, since it taught the existence of two ἀρχαί (archæ), or *sources*, in the Godhead. To this the Latins replied that the Holy Ghost was called in

Scripture the Spirit of the Son as well as of the Father, and that the former was said to have authority to *send* Him into the world, and in general that the procession from both the other persons of the Holy Trinity was the doctrine of the Bible. That the *temporal mission*, or *sending forth in time*, of the Spirit was attributable to both the Father and the Son was denied by neither party. The dispute turned upon His *eternal procession*, or origin, and was chiefly due to the clumsiness of the Latin language, in which the word corresponding to our "proceedeth from" had not the fullness of meaning discoverable in the Greek synonym. Εκπορευόμενον (Ecporeuomenon) contains the idea of issuing forth as from a fountain, whereas the Latin did not imply necessarily any more than such a derivation as is expressed in the phrase, Who proceedeth from the Father *through* the Son. All the demands of the Latin would be met by a procession from the Son as from a medium of communication, whereas the Greek required that the Son should be a source, fountain, or independent origin. It was not to be expected that the Orientals would regard very complacently an innovation which, according to their idiom, opened two distinct springs of being or essence in the Godhead, and consequently overthrew, by necessary deduction, the very doctrine of the Trinity which it had been introduced to support; for they were acute enough to perceive that, if the Son was an independent source of the divine substance, He must be an independent God.

The coronation of Charlemagne, in the year 800, as emperor of the West severed the last link which bound the Latin patriarch to the Byzantine throne, but the century thus inaugurated had nearly expired before the firmer bands of religious union had been broken, and Rome and Constantinople stood shouting defiance at each other across an impassable chasm. The disruption was immediately occasioned by two men of remarkable character who were advanced to those sees, respectively, about the middle of this century. The pontificate of Nicholas I. is memorable as the commencement of a new era in the history of the papacy. It was his peculiar good fortune to be thrown by his ambition itself upon the side of the right, to become on two occasions seemingly the champion of the oppressed, thus winning to himself popular sympathy while striving vigorously to establish precedents utterly destructive of law and liberty. His claims to autocratic rule

covered both the civil and the ecclesiastical domain. Lothaire, brother of Lewis II., then Emperor of Germany, and himself king of Lotharingia, having separated from his lawful wife Theutberga, and married another, named Waldrada, was by him not only threatened with excommunication unless he should reform his manner of living, but was also given to understand that the pope had doubts of his title to be called king as long as he continued the sinful connection: this, of course, was nothing more than the faintest premonitory symptom of the unbounded assumption regarding the two swords, of temporal and spiritual dominion, which Hildebrand was to put forth. In another affair Nicholas successfully intermeddled in the private concerns of the archbishopric of Rheims on behalf of a suffragan whom Hincmar had degraded, but did not subdue the Frankish prelate without a severe struggle, nor without having recourse to those Decretals which the unscrupulous piety of the age had forged in the name of Isidore, a celebrated bishop of Seville in the sixth century. In these and other contests Nicholas manifested considerable skill and determination, and made some little show of courage: he also gained some applause. He particularly distinguished himself in a struggle which brought him face to face with the most learned ecclesiastic of the age.

It was the crime of Ignatius, as upright and conscientious a prelate as ever sat in the chair of Gregory and Chrysostom, to have taken the Baptist for his model and rebuked the dissolute minister of a dissolute emperor for committing incest with his son's widow. To punish his fidelity, Michael III. raised a layman, on six consecutive days, through the six ordinations (three of them being to what are known as *minor* orders) which had then become necessary, and set him in the throne which really belonged to Ignatius. The new honors doubtless sat lightly enough upon a head long accustomed to civic triumphs. Already he was commander of the imperial guard, first senator of Constantinople, and chief private secretary to the emperor, when selected to fill the highest position in the Eastern Church. The vast range of his erudition and the vigor of his mind gave ample assurance that he could cope with the intellectual demands of his station. Nor is there much in the history of his episcopate to show that the emperor's choice had not been even wiser yet,—from the standpoint of a licentious monarch anxious to escape the irritation of being

reprimanded for his misdeeds, or in any way reminded of their sinfulness,—as Photius, with all his talents and acquirements, seems to have been very little concerned for the interests of true religion.

Nicholas took the part of Ignatius, and refused to recognize the usurper. In 862, he held a council at Rome which excommunicated Photius and his adherents, and was repaid in the same coin by the Eastern patriarch, who manifested singular indifference to the anathemas which had been hurled at him. It is not, however, to be supposed that the pope's indignation fed only upon pity for Ignatius; for the old sore of rivalry still rankled, and, although the image-worshiping Photius gave no provocation on the score of iconoclasm, he was no more ready than his predecessors to concede to Rome the jurisdiction she claimed over provinces which acknowledged the sway of the Eastern emperor, and particularly now over Bulgaria, which had lately been converted by the Greek Church, but nevertheless leaned in a rather strange manner towards the Latins. The battle continued to rage, with some intermissions, after Nicholas had been taken from the scene, and even after Photius, having been retired by Basil the Macedonian, restored by him on the death of Ignatius, and banished by Leo the Philosopher, had ended his life in a monastery of Armenia. It is difficult to decide precisely at what date the warfare culminated in a permanent cessation of friendly intercourse, but the year 881 may be selected as near enough for ordinary purposes.

It was impossible that the two communions should not come more or less into contact with each other, for not only would merchants, scholars, and other members of either, invade the territories of the other for purposes of commerce, business, learning, and pleasure, but the flags of the powers with which they were allied confronted each other on the very soil of Italy. Constantinople held sway over most of the provinces of southern Europe as far towards the Occident as Apulia; which, however, was at length torn from its feeble hold by the terrible adventurers, who marched under the banner of William of Hauteville, and made the name of the Normans so dreadful to degenerate Asiatic or undisciplined Italian. The wish would frequently suggest itself to prince or patriarch that fraternal relations might be resumed, so that the combined strength of their dominions, civil or ecclesi-

astical, might be employed upon a common foe, and the disagreeableness of enmity might be exchanged for the delights and advantages of friendly association. In or about the year 1024 Basil II., a warlike monarch, negotiated with a pusillanimous pope, John XIX., for a peace upon the basis of an acknowledged equality of the two sees; but the feeling was too strong in the West against any such concessions of dignity and prerogative to allow the prelate to enter into a compact of that nature. The ear of Leo the Great or of Nicholas I. could never have been gained to a proposal so contrary to their lofty claims, but a succession of weak and corrupt occupants had at this time greatly lowered the standing, and diminished the influence, of the papacy. A further insult was offered the Latin Church by Michael Cerularius, patriarch of Constantinople. It seems that mutual courtesy had established the custom of permitting the Greeks to use their own ritual in Rome, and the Latins theirs in the other capital. Such liberality was distasteful to the narrow mind of this ecclesiastic, who, not content with closing all the churches of the city in which the rites of the Romish ritual were observed and taking other measures to suppress the worship of that communion, was injudicious or malicious enough to write, with the assistance of Leo, bishop of Acrida, a passionate letter attacking the entire Western Church. Translating this letter into Latin, Cardinal Humbert used it to arouse the indignation of Leo IX. The same prelate proceeded, with little reluctance, to break a lance in behalf of the Roman see by replying in an elaborate and powerful refutation of the charges directed against it. The rising flame at once caught the eye of Constantine Monomachus, who, in the hope of extinguishing it, immediately addressed himself to the injured prelate of the West. Leo consented to dispatch three commissioners on an embassy to Constantinople, among whom was the cardinal who had already shown a tendency to assume the championship. The negotiations did not go on smoothly, for neither the delegates nor Michael were likely to yield a single point. The emperor threw the weight of his influence into the Roman scale, but could not overcome the inflexible determination of the patriarch to make no concessions, and not even to hold any intercourse with the delegates. However, an incendiary production of a certain Nicetas was committed to the flames, and he himself compelled publicly, not only to retract what he had written, but to acknowledge the

supremacy of the Western patriarch. Then the legates entered the church of St. Sophia, and, having condemned Michael and his followers, placed upon the altar a document stating this fact in fiery language. But a licentious and feeble ruler could neither shield the envoys from the rising wrath of the populace, nor persevere in the course which his own dignity pointed out. After the legates had profited by a hint he contrived to give them and withdrawn from the city, he was obliged to surrender at discretion. The haughty patriarch and his council, in the year 1054, hurled back the anathemas of Rome. Thus, instead of being closed up, the breach had been widened. Henceforth a new subject of controversy is to part the churches and afford opprobrious epithets to be freely used whenever the strife grows hotter than usual. The names *Azymites* and *Prozymites* shall designate those who believe, with Rome, that unleavened bread was employed at the institution of the Lord's Supper, and ought to be sedulously provided for every celebration of the Eucharist, and those who think, with Constantinople and the remaining patriarchates, that the common, leavened bread of every-day use will both fulfill all the requirements and proprieties of the case, and also more exactly symbolize the doctrine which is intended to be taught in this sacrament.

The Crusades had the effect of bringing the Latins into closer proximity to the Greeks than was pleasing either to the state or to the church of the latter. The ingenuity of the Byzantines was sufficiently exercised during the first three of those movements in diverting from themselves the ambitious, avaricious, and warlike projects of the numerous hosts who flung themselves upon trembling Asia. At length the day came when Venetian galleys, laden with martial pilgrims, after having reduced Zara to subjection, swept by the Queen of the Bosporus and came to anchor in the harbor of Chalcedon. Disregarding the anathemas of Pope Innocent III., the leaders had lent a ready ear to the urgings of the young Alexius, who had been traveling through portions of Europe in the hope of inducing some of its valiant rulers to undertake the cause of his deposed father. The promises of this prince that he and his father would, immediately upon regaining power, submit themselves to the Latin patriarch, and that he would furnish them with valuable assistance against the Saracens, enabled Dandolo and his coädjutors to reconcile their consciences to

such a departure from their original plan as was involved in a siege of Constantinople. Evidently some master mind controlled their counsels, and one of great independence and courage, too. That leader the maritime republic had given them in a man whose heroic soul rose superior to the weight of more years than are allotted to man and to the greater disadvantage of sightlessness. Frank valor and Venetian skill proved an overmatch for the languid strength of the reigning Alexius, who fled under cover of the night and took refuge in Thrace. Isaac Angelus was rescued from a dungeon, and crowned, together with his son, beneath the dome of St. Sophia. The Latins strenuously urged the fulfillment of the stipulations that had been made them before they turned their prows towards the Dardanelles. Alexius could not overcome the repugnance of his subjects to concessions so degrading in their eyes as those which were to chain them to the footstool of the pope. While he temporized, occidental patience gradually became exhausted, till three envoys from each of the two allied nations rode through an angry mob, advanced into the imperial presence, and bade defiance to the astonished sovereigns. The war was renewed. Constantinople endured a second siege, and had to submit to the horrors of a sack. The count of Flanders ascended the throne under the name of Baldwin I., in the year 1204; and thus was established a Latin empire in Constantinople. During its brief existence the Greek Church suffered much humiliation; but speedily emerged from the shadow when Michael Palæologus, in 1261, wrenched the sceptre from the hated foreigners and restored it to the successors of Constantine. However, a party favorable to the Western doctrines had in the meantime grown up. Its strength was partly due to the negotiations of John Vatatzes, an able prince, who from Nice as a base had striven to erect once more the fallen monarchy, and with a view to compassing that end had sought to win the countenance of the pope. In connection with Germanus, the Byzantine bishop, he had made overtures to the Roman see, which drew thence an embassage charged with a somewhat conciliatory commission. There the matter had ended, except that a not unimportant party sprang up disposed to content themselves with the permission to omit the Filioque, and with such other concessions as were offered them. Michael Palæologus sought to strengthen himself on the newly recovered throne by pushing forward similar measures, and actu-

ally went the length of formally recognizing the primacy of the pope at the council of Lyons, July 6th, 1274, by the submission of a large delegation comprised of Germanus, formerly patriarch of Constantinople, the metropolitan of Cæsarea, and other dignitaries who were under the influence of the court. Joseph was deposed from the patriarchal throne because of his invincible opposition to the treaty, and a man exalted into his place who had been brought over by the argument of a prison-cell; but nothing could overcome the universal repugnance of the Greeks, which of course triumphed very speedily. Finding that a persistent attempt to enforce the *Union* would alienate many even of his nearest kin and closest friends from him, the emperor could evince no warmth in carrying out the treaty he had been at so much pains to make. Upon his devoted head descended, in 1281, the bolt of papal excommunication, finishing his disgrace, and perhaps hastening his death, which, the next year, was the signal for the dispersion of the Latin party.

Dandolo had taught the Greek Empire that its capital was not impregnable. From the day that the banner of St. Mark led the crusaders victorious through the streets of Constantinople, that city trembled at the distant or near sound of the Turkish march, and naturally turned for protection to the Christian nations of Europe. When the emir Orchan was rapidly reducing city after city of Bithynia, and planting the crescent in sight of the imperial palace, Andronicus III. Palæologus, bethought him to send ambassadors, among whom was the learned monk Barlaam, to solicit peace from Pope Benedict XII., who "kept his state" at Avignon. John Cantacuzene opened equally fruitless negotiations with the princely and dissolute Clement VI., and then, threatened on every side and justly alarmed for the safety of his throne, John Palæologus I. humbled himself before Urban V. at the Vatican itself. The fated period drew nigh which was to witness the overthrow of Constantine's marvelously long-lived empire. At length the cannon of Amurath hurled their death-dealing missiles over the Byzantine walls, proclaiming in voices of thunder that the end was at hand, now that an agent of destruction had been found against which that ancient dependence, Greek-fire, could not hope to hold its own. No expedient suggested itself to the reigning prince but the old one of appealing to Western Christendom. The time was a peculiarly favorable one, too, for addressing the Latins,

since they were at strife among themselves, and either party would, therefore, welcome the opportunity of winning prestige by bringing about a reünion with the Orient. The great council of Basle had, in 1431, undertaken several most important tasks, among which were those of reüniting the two sections of Christendom and of reforming the Church in its head and members; and manifested so creditable a spirit of independence that the Vatican had become alarmed, and sought to remove it to Bologna, in order to subject it to those influences which the *curia* knew so well how to wield. The council had refused to obey the papal command, and even dared to summon Eugenius IV. before it. He first sent, and then withdrew, delegates, and afterwards convened an opposing council at Ferrara, soon removing it to Florence; but was condemned and excommunicated, together with all the members of his synod, and finally deposed, by the assembly at Basle.

Not being fettered by the necessity of holding prolonged conferences before the proper method of action could be decided upon, Eugenius promptly dispatched nine galleys to transport the sacred persons of the emperor and his attendant prelates safely across the seas. The vessels of the synod arrived at the Golden Horn somewhat later than their rivals, but nevertheless waited hopefully for the decision of the wavering emperor. The council had been scarcely less impolitic in its language than tardy in its movements, and had actually called the Greek faith an *old heresy*,—not a very complimentary title, surely! Palæologus himself, accompanied by Joseph of Constantinople, Mark of Ephesus, Dionysius of Sardis, Bessarion of Nicæa, the metropolitans of Heraclea, Cyzicus, Nicomedia, and Trebizond, and others, embarked in the papal fleet and set sail for Venice, at which city a reception awaited him which showed what a republic could do when disposed to honor a distinguished visitor. Glad to escape from a city decorated with the spoils of his own metropolis, and from being constantly reminded of the days which saw the Lion of St. Mark and the Eagles of Rome haughtily triumphant on the banks of the Bosporus, he presently entered Ferrara in state, was intercepted when he would have bent the knee before his Highness the Pope, and, after having been welcomed with a paternal embrace, was honorably seated at the left hand of the papal chair. The patriarch demanded and received a scarcely less honorable reception,

nor were the other bishops behind their chief in manifesting independence: they had no mind to degrade themselves by performing the customary act of fealty and kissing the feet of his Excellence. After all his trouble, Eugenius perhaps reflected, not without sadness, that he had not accomplished much that would advance his projects, or strengthen him against the Basle assembly. Palæologus even disputed the presidency of the synod, but was reminded that, when Constantine or Theodosius directed the deliberations of the assembled bishops, the lordly prelate of Rome had not been personally present.

A scarcity of Western bishops delayed the proceedings, and the breaking out of a plague was made the occasion of moving the assembly to Florence, but in the year 1439 all things seemed to have converged towards a favorable issue, agreement having been reached upon all the disputed topics. To be sure, the Latin side had won a complete triumph, and imposed their own views regarding the Double Procession and the Filioque, Purgatory, and the Papal Supremacy upon the Oriental delegates, and had persuaded them to acknowledge the lawfulness of using unleavened bread in the Eucharist; but the Greeks had lain under no compulsion in yielding their assent, and might pardonably indulge the hope that a treaty which had received the sanction of so many learned dignitaries would not be rejected by those whom they represented. On a memorable day, July 6th, 1439, two ecclesiastics read the act of Union in their respective languages from the pulpit of the Florentine cathedral, and then embraced each other in the sight of the two peoples. One of these was Cardinal Julian, the other was no less a personage than the celebrated Bessarion, who forsook the archbishopric of Nicæa for the red hat of a cardinal, and transferred all his learning and ability to the permanent service of the Western Church. After this transaction the Roman liturgy was proceeded with, and the creed chanted with its unauthorized addition.

The emperor and the prelates returned as they had come, except Joseph, who had breathed his last, and Bessarion. Did they feel any sinking of the heart, premonitory of the fate that awaited them? Where were the succors which they had expected to bring back with them? Where, the tokens of the victories they had been so sure of winning over the dull minds of the West? Instead of these they bore with them a treaty of peace which was

simply disgraceful. The indignation of the populace, we may well believe, expressed itself in mutterings and derisive shouts, and in persistent non-attendance upon the ministrations of the faithless deputies. The successor of Joseph officiated in an empty church. The primate of Russia, who had also attended at Florence, was deposed, and consigned to a monastery: he escaped with difficulty from the rage of a justly-incensed people. Mark of Ephesus alone had stood out against all arguments and persuasions, and refused to sign the concordat: consequently the admiring regard and love of the people surrounded him with the glory of a hero.

In 1453 Mahomet II. profaned St. Sophia with the shadow of the crescent and the accursed sound of an impious prayer, and the Greek Empire had ceased to exist,—though not the Greek Church.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE EUCHARISTIC CONTROVERSY.

Greek civilization and the Greek race have been tried and found wanting, as the Jewish had been before them. The Gospel was, first of all, offered to a nation most admirably fitted, in every way except one, to receive it. Fifteen centuries of education had so thoroughly indoctrinated the national mind with certain necessary ideas, and so thoroughly perfected the organization of the Church which God had given a claim upon the allegiance of the people, that the one ought to have received the new revelation with eagerness and satisfaction, and to have understood it with ease and accuracy; while the other should have spontaneously converted itself into a most powerful instrument for preserving, defending, and promulgating it. Had the Jewish Church only, as a church, accepted the Gospel, how differently would have read the chronicles of history! No insignificant race, is that Jewish. Had it consecrated to the new Faith its noble qualities of intellect, its enterprising spirit, its indomitable courage, and its high capability of endurance, there would have been no necessity for making choice of another race to bear the brunt of the struggle. But the Jew threw away the golden opportunity; which was then presented to a people, endowed with even superior powers of intellect, and basking in the noontide of the most advanced civilization that the world had yet witnessed. For a while, the Greeks stood forth as champions of the truth, and performed wonders in shielding it from the furious assaults of heresy; but gradually all mental energy seems to slip from them, they become mere conservators of tradition, and even, as their civilization retrogrades into effeteness, allow the traditional faith itself to be tampered with. The Romans, who have partly borne the same burden and shared the same exalted calling, after having demonstrated on many a field their fidelity to those statements which they had recognized as true

when drawn up and defended by the astuter Greeks, have followed them in their downfall. Christianity participates in the westward march of empire. Where Cæsar's legions had bridged swollen streams, forced their way through trackless forests, or watched incessantly for the ambuscades of Vercingetorix, a new civilization was slowly growing up. The barbarians had easily overwhelmed the scattered provinces of the West, but had, in their turn, been subdued by those whom they had vanquished in arms. The language, laws, and learning of the Latins proved themselves too strong to be eradicated or supplanted, and, absorbing into themselves everything that was worth appropriating among the manners and customs of the conquerors, gradually brought the vigorous Goths, Franks, or Lombards under their dominion, and thus gave birth to a new, fresh, and solid civilization, which had this great advantage over the old, that it had incorporated into itself many valuable Christian principles, and was therefore built upon a more enduring foundation. The Frankish intellect soon manifests great activity, considerable versatility, respectable breadth and strength, some profundity, and unusual judiciousness. While a fatal lethargy settles down upon the Greeks, after John Damascenus and Photius have gilded the sunset sky of that communion; while North Africa is suffering from Saracenic invasion, and almost equally from the encroachments of the sands; while Rome is killing out all independence of thought with the blight of spiritual despotism, a powerful empire is consolidating beyond the Alps which inherits at once the hardy, fearless, unfettered mind of the barbarian, and the culture, experience, skill, and knowledge of the Latin. Thither let us turn for scholars and divines, for philosophical discussions of controverted points, for able expositions of the faith which was committed to the custody of the saints. Having already seen the Franks playing a conspicuous part in two such controversies as those concerning Predestination and Image-worship, we should be less surprised at discovering them in the characters of originators of a discussion that has well-nigh outlived those two, important as they were, and tenacious of existence as they were also, and attended their funerals in seemly robes of mourning.

The progress of the Iconoclastic controversy revealed the gradual development of a tendency to obliterate the distinctions between the ideal and the sensuous, and to confound the repre-

sentation or symbol with the thing represented or symbolized. The retrogression of mind during those centuries in which the old-world civilization, its agonies having been hastened by the ruthless violence of the barbaric invaders, was undergoing the throes of parturition preparatory to the birth of one which should be higher and better, gave free scope to certain proclivities which are latent in the most enlightened bosom. Ridiculous as it appears to an educated understanding that any person should mistake a plaster image for the Being who made the universe, the fact, nevertheless, is that countless myriads of souls have been, and are, not far removed from that absurd and brutal error, and that numerous individuals of high culture and no small mental power allow imagination or fancy to get the upper hand of judgment and convert shadow into substance. The dispute about images could not, in the very nature of things, have continued very long without leading to a discussion concerning the consecrated elements and their relation to the person and natures of our Lord. As He Himself is, according to the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, "the brightness of" the Father's "glory, and the *express image* of His person," so the bread and wine are, after consecration, closely related to the God-man whose flesh and blood they have become. If they have been elevated into actual participation of His humanity, then, being part and parcel of Him, they may seem to deserve the same adoration which is due to Him; while if they are mere symbols of an absent Christ, they still may arrogate to themselves a certain degree of veneration, equal to that which is so freely granted by some to pictures of the Saviour.

In 831 there emanated from the active brain of a Frankish monk, who was to preside over the celebrated monastery of Corbey, a treatise which has made the name of its author, Paschasius Radbert, famous as that of the originator of the First Eucharistic Controversy. Warin, abbot of New Corbey, possibly little suspected what a fire he was kindling when he requested his former master to compose a book upon the Eucharist for the benefit of the daughter monastery. Paschasius took very extreme positions, teaching that the unlimited power of God, while suffering the appearance of the material substances to remain unchanged, actually converts the elements into the same body which was born of the Virgin Mary and crucified under Pontius Pilate, the mis-

leading semblance being left in order to try the faith of the worshipers, and remind them that sight, feeling, and taste are not the means by which we feed upon the Word of God. The way for the acceptance of this doctrine had been paved by such miracles as those, of changing water into wine and multiplying so amazingly the loaves and fishes, which displayed so clearly the control of God over the forces and laws of the visible world. It was said to be no more difficult to credit the miraculous increase of Christ's body through the incorporation into it of the sacred elements than to believe in the unexampled birth from a virgin. Such was the general drift of the revised copy which Paschasius sent to Charles the Bald, at his imperial request, a few years later. The learned abbot probably did not suppose that he was fabricating an entirely new theory, and one which was destined to have very pernicious results; but had committed the very common mistake of translating rhetoric into logic. It will not always answer to affix a strict literal interpretation to the glowing imagery of Oriental oratory. The fervid language of a Chrysostom was not likely to deceive an audience that was in perfect sympathy with him, but could hardly bear the test of cold reasoning; not that it was really illogical or false, but that it could be made to seem so when viewed through a denser medium. It is not at all surprising that this treatise occasioned considerable commotion, and drew forth replies from various leading divines, foremost among whom was Rabanus Maurus, archbishop of Mentz and the ablest teacher, and disputant, and writer of his day and nation. A pupil of his, named Walafrid Strabo, also engaged in the warfare, as did Christian Druthmar and others. Two distinguished authors were directed by Charles to give him in writing their opinions on the subject. In compliance with this request, the freethinking Scotus (John Scotus Erigena) gave forth a work which has perished, but is supposed to have rationalized away all meaning out of the sacrament and reduced it to a bare commemoration. The other scholar was one who had previously been consulted by the same sovereign on the subject of predestination, and enjoyed the reputation of being one of the best theologians of his time. Ratram, although embarrassed by his position as a monk of Corbey, nevertheless expressed convictions wholly at variance with those of his abbot, and supported them with much clearness and cogency in a celebrated treatise, "Concerning the Body and

Blood of the Lord," which afterwards enjoyed the high honor of converting Bishop Ridley and the English Church from Transubstantiation. He undertakes to answer two questions: First, whether there is any *real* change of the elements at all, or not; and secondly, whether, supposing that there is an alteration, the transformation is one into the same body which Christ had on earth. He reasons very forcibly that any actual change must manifest itself to the senses, and that, inasmuch as the senses are not cognizant of any change whatever, the only supposable transmutation is an invisible, spiritual one, which takes place for the benefit of man's soul. Then, as regards the second division of his subject, he distinguishes between two methods of viewing it, and says that in a *true and proper sense* the elements do not become the actual risen body of Christ, but that they do become so in an *improper and spiritual* sense, inasmuch as they are the "image and pledge" of it.

Although holding the unpopular view, Paschasius was by no means without supporters, but numbered among them such prominent men as Haymo of Halberstadt, who had been a fellow-student of archbishop Maurus and was not altogether unworthy of having a name associated with his in the republic of letters, and Hincmar, the sturdy resister of papal aggression. The various contestants relied much upon the authority of those illustrious Fathers, Ambrose of Milan and Augustine of Hippo, the latter of whom was beginning to exert an almost despotic sway over the Latin church. Radbert's book is for the observant reader of history a sort of channel-buoy, which serves the double purpose of indicating which way the tide is setting and how high it has risen. The flood tide of *realism* or *materialism* had evidently begun, but had not yet acquired sufficient power to turn the current, except close along the sheltered banks, although it had perceptibly checked its flow. Let us take advantage of the slack water and easy navigation to cast the lead and study our charts, preparatory to rushing along with the full sweep of the rising river.

In attempting, then, to understand the language of Holy Scripture in reference to the Eucharist, a proper starting-point seems to be an examination of the testimony of our senses, in regard to their reliability. Beyond dispute, our eyes testify that the bread and wine wear the same outward appearance after the consecration, and our hands and palates proclaim that no differ-

ence can be perceived between consecrated and unconsecrated bread and wine. Nor is this merely negative evidence; for, if the bread and wine are converted into anything, they are converted into flesh and blood; but our senses of sight, feeling, and taste, in conjunction, are surely competent to pronounce whether certain food is flesh and blood, or bread and wine; and they do unequivocally declare that what the priest puts into our mouths is not flesh and blood, but positively and without a shadow of a doubt bread and wine. Now, we must either accept or reject the testimony of our senses, it not being at all reasonable to build upon it or pass it by just as we happen to be inclined at the moment. Shall we reject the testimony of our senses? How, then, can we ever be convinced that our Saviour opened the eyes of the blind, enabled the lame to walk, or fed the multitude? Indeed, how shall we ever answer the Docetæ, when they tell us that His body was nothing more than a phantom? Of what significance is the handling of His wounds by the doubting Thomas to a man who yields no credence to his own senses? Had such a man stood full before the glorious Sufferer and beheld His face stained with blood and His back furrowed by the scourge, had he lifted Him with his own hands from the accursed tree, had he gazed upon Him after His resurrection while eating the common viands supplied by the disciples, that man would have had no ground whatever for believing that the Saviour actually was crucified, or that He actually rose again. Nor can we stop even at this low grade of skepticism, for an iron necessity is upon us and drags us down to the lowest abyss of unbelief; since, if a man cannot trust to his senses, he knows nothing whatever about the external world or himself. Unless we wish to embrace such foul consequences, we must accept the witness of those senses which the God who created us surely did not give in order to deceive us. The Bible discloses to us many mysteries which are hidden from our bodily organs, teaches us to see hosts of angels encamped around us, to fear before the all-seeing eye of an Omnipotent God, and even to believe that angels and the Son of God Himself have taken human forms for temporary purposes; it informs us that Christ exercised incomprehensible power over the agencies of the natural world; but never does it call upon us to confess that what we see does not really exist, or what we have heard was not really spoken. On the contrary, it recognizes tacitly the incapacity under which

it labors of addressing us at all, or of persuading us, except through an appeal to one or more of our senses. It is undoubtedly true that eyes and ears become organically diseased or are temporarily disordered by mental excitement, so that there is need to correct their verdicts by the judgment; but we would desire to be told how it is possible that there should be any irregular action in the case now before us. Can it be that the collective verdict of all who have ever communed is wrong, and that the bread, after all, is flesh, and the wine, blood?

Again, we are distinctly taught that Christ resumed His body on the third day after that body had been nailed to the cross, that He retained it till the fortieth day after His resurrection, that He ascended with it into the Heaven of heavens, disappearing with it from the tearful eyes of His disciples, and that He sat down with it at the right hand of His Father, awaiting the appointed hour for Him to return in it to this earth and judge the living and the dead. In that same body, still bearing the wounds of the thorns, and the marks of the nails, and the ridges of the lash,—the glorious scars of these as monuments of His unrivaled victories,—He now stands interceding for us, miserable sinners, who would not dare, without such an advocate, to approach the mercy-seat. That body was not an imaginary, phantasmagorical body, but one of real flesh and blood derived from the Virgin-mother; and even after the resurrection it was not freed from conditions of space, for the blessed lips assured Mary Magdalene that He had not yet ascended into Heaven. In short, the risen and glorified body of Christ is in heaven, and *not on earth*. That it is joined in indissoluble personal union with Divinity is no more a reason why it should partake of the attributes of deity than the existence of the same conjunction was a reason why Christ's body should have been everywhere present while it was on earth.

Furthermore, the body of which we partake in the Holy Eucharist, if we partake of any, is not the glorified body at all. When Christ spoke the celebrated words of institution, He was not yet beyond His hour of greatest humiliation; He Himself, not yet crucified, is there, in plain sight of all, in His own proper form, lifts with His human hand common bread, the same which the disciples had been eating, and solemnly declares, "This is my body which is given for you;" takes a cup, filled with common wine, and says, "This is my blood which is shed for

you." Plainly that bread and wine are not the body of the Lord in actuality, either of humiliation or of glory, for there is the frame of the well-known Master whole before their eyes; and, if these difficulties could be removed, the insurmountable one would still confront us, that much stress is put upon the *breaking* and the *shedding*, far too much to allow of our interpreting the words of Christ's *glorified* body. But no body of Christ actually exists anywhere except the risen body which is glorified in the heavens above: therefore no actual presence of a crucified body is possible in the Communion.

We cannot permit the conclusion thus reached to be shaken by any arguments that may be brought against it from the armory of *faith*, for we cannot stand passive, and let the ground be cut from beneath our feet, and ourselves be buried under a promiscuous ruin of science, philosophy, and religion. What we shall do with the conclusion, what is its exact meaning, how far we shall press it,—these are questions which we must prepare ourselves to examine with great caution; but the conclusion itself, as a conclusion, must be held at the risk of our lives. It may present a forbidding aspect; it may detach us from our friends; it may even seem to carry us over to the infidel camp. No matter! The conclusion has been duly and logically reached, is so far from being unreasonable that the contrary opinion is not even supposable, and has the sanction of primitive antiquity and of a long and full catena of the ablest and most orthodox authorities. Let us dismiss all wavering and plant ourselves firmly upon our chosen ground; and yet let us be sure that this one-sided view has not revealed to us the whole of the truth.

Having now proved that Christ is *not* present in the Holy Eucharist, we will proceed to show that He *is* present therein. If, as we most firmly believe, He is God consubstantial with the Father, He must be everywhere, and consequently cannot be absent from the church, altar, paten: moreover, since, notwithstanding the omnipresence of the divine essence, it may be especially localized, as it were, by a sort of concentrated presence in a given spot, He may very properly be revered as resting in unusual plenitude of divine majesty, not only within the consecrated walls which surround the devout congregation, but still more where the consecrated symbols repose upon the holy table. Wherever the Godhead of Christ is, there Christ is, and Christ is always and for-

ever man as well as God. It is not intended to be asserted that Christ is everywhere for the purpose of being worshiped,—that it would be right to prostrate ourselves before a stone edifice and say our prayers to it, because the Lord vouchsafes to be in the midst of two or three gathered together in His name,—but that, as Jehovah was pleased to fill Solomon's temple with His visible glory, and to dwell permanently between the cherubim within the Holy of Holies, so He dignifies the Christian Church with a real, if invisible, excellence of divine radiance hovering above and around the altar of sacrificial commemoration.

He is there also representatively through the Holy Ghost, who is His vicar, by whose agency it comes to pass both that the elements are purified and made ready for the ministerial act of God's anointed priest, whereby, through the same instrumentality, they are converted into symbols of divine love, and also that the souls and bodies of the faithful are sanctified and prepared for the reception of those pledges.

Besides these kinds of presence, there is requisite, in order to justify the language of the Bible, a presence and communication of His body, that very body which was crucified for us. Nothing less than that can satisfy the requirements of the words of Institution, which not only declare that the elements *are* the body and blood of Christ, but call upon the disciples to partake of them on that very ground. More emphatic still were the teachings of our Saviour in the synagogue of Capernaum, on that memorable occasion when many of His own disciples were offended at Him and left Him, because they did not see how He could give them His flesh to eat. Why did He not remove the stumbling-block out of their path by the simple and obvious explanation, that He did not mean anything more than that they should feed upon His *doctrine?* Why did He not guard them against the misapprehension that they were in some way to press His flesh with their teeth? There can be but one answer: Because He had intended to clothe in those words some truth of deep mysteriousness which could not be conveyed in more appropriate phraseology, some fact of the invisible world which must be taught at any risk. If, on the one hand, it may lead to absurdity and superstition to insist upon the strict literal rendering of every passage in the revealed Word, so, on the other hand, the barren wastes of materialism must be reached, sooner or later, by the interpreter who resolves all difficult

declarations and allusions into mere metaphor, allegory, and type.

And thus once more we stand perplexed between two contradictions. Shall we come down from the position we so confidently assumed a little while since, and admit that we must have been mistaken about the impossibility of an actual alteration of the elements into that of which they are the symbols? Shall we confess that the crucified body of Christ is actually and really present in the Eucharist? We will not leave our vantage ground till we are unable to hold it any longer, and that time has not arrived yet: at present we do not perceive what we could expect to gain by so doing, for, should we confess that the flesh and blood are really there in material substance, we would not be one step nearer to the understanding of how carnal flesh and blood can be eaten by the spirit of man. The idea that Christ's body is to be crushed by our teeth and subjected to the digestive action of our systems, is so revolting as to send a shudder through us at the bare mention of it. The only imaginable or credible feeding is one in which the spirit alone has part: the body may and does eat the symbols, but what alone can feed upon the realities is the immaterial portion of man's complex nature, which cannot masticate and absorb material substances by any conceivable or inconceivable process. The spirit cannot eat corporeal things; it is only able to appropriate incorporeal nourishment. We might just as well invite a famished traveler to regale himself upon the abstruse and difficult pages of Newton's Principia or Laplace's Méchanique Céleste and the lighter verses of Milton or Southey, as think to satisfy the cravings of a sinful and struggling spirit by setting before it a repast of carnal flesh and blood. "They drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them; and that Rock was Christ;" "He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water;"—how will the literalists deal with such passages as these? Man's immortal nature can feed upon the benefits that accrue to it by reason of the breaking of Christ's blessed body and the shedding of His blessed blood, and these benefits can be specially conveyed to it by the Great High-priest through the intervention of a ceremony well calculated to lift the heart in faith, love, and adoration towards His eternal Throne. In such a banquet the crucified body is both absent and present,—absent to the senses, to the understanding, and absent

in every corporeal, carnal, and material sense; but present to faith, present as to the receiving of all possible advantages that can proceed from a partaking of it, and therefore present in the lofty ideal *reality* of a transcendental conception. Is such a reality no *reality* at all? Not unless there is no reality in that which enables the sorely-tried soul of the sinner, rising victorious above the power of temptation and the fascination of this world, to lay firm hold upon eternal life. We cannot take Everlasting Life up in our hands, turn it over, and strike it with the geologist's hammer; nor has it any material existence of any kind whatever: is it therefore a nonentity? No more can we handle or examine the sacramental body of Christ, or convince ourselves that it has any material being or any corporeal presence; but must we then sadly admit to ourselves that in holding, as the Holy Catholic Church has instructed us to do, firmly to the *reality* of our feeding upon it, by faith, in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, we have been amusing ourselves with a golden illusion? Never, till we are confuted in the course of reasoning which persuades us that the invisible and immaterial is far more enduring, substantial, and *real* than all that we ever saw, or felt, or tasted, of the fleeting entities of the visible world.

This theory cannot, without gross injustice, be accused of robbing the sacrament of its value. Is the act of stretching out the hands to receive the bread of life, of conveying it to the lips, of chewing and swallowing it, a *real* act? Far more real is the transaction that invisibly accompanies it, for, at that instant and by those means, the inmost soul of a faithful recipient is strengthened and refreshed by the grace of God, being endowed with blessings which it would not otherwise obtain. Both the sacraments which were ordained by Christ to be generally observed, are "outward, visible" signs of transactions which actually occur in the kingdom of God. The second birth is as real as the first. At the very hour when the person is baptized in the Triune Name, a certain accession of spiritual force comes to him, by which he *can* overpower sin, Satan, and death, and a change is wrought whereby he is enabled to purify his inner nature. Should he improve his advantages and make some progress in cleansing himself from sin, he will (so to speak) presently exhaust his supply of grace and be in need of its renewal. What shall he do? What course does the child pursue who has toiled in his merry

pastimes till his body has drawn to the full upon its stock of food and craves more? His instinct directs him to seek nourishment. What the meal furnished by parental love is to the infant, that is the Holy Eucharist to the faithful soul, the means by which it obtains a fresh supply of strength. The act of taking food is as real and as necessary in one case as in the other, for if the Christian neglects to approach the holy table, he dies as surely as the hungry child who can get nothing to eat. In either instance it is true that man does not live by bread alone, but that God can sustain him without it when He sees adequate cause, and yet that under ordinary circumstances a natural law brings a slow but inevitable death. It is an awful thing to enter the presence-chamber of Omnipotence and fall low on our knees with hands opened for the reception of blessings which Infinite Mercy alone can bestow. If gratitude can touch the heart of a forgiven sinner, it must be at the moment when the full benefit of the Redeemer's passion is communicated to it. If awe can envelop the adoring mind, when will it do so with more certainty than during an hour passed in commemorating and recalling the amazing events of Christ's crucifixion, and in contemplating Him ascended into heaven and giving us the good gifts which He gained for us by His obedience unto death? Realizing by faith the nearness of our Saviour, profoundly impressed with that sense of His divinity which springs from the thought of His boundless love, assisted by the stillness and devotion of the assembled communicants, by the coöperation of angels and archangels, by the significant acts of the officiating priest, and by the elevating tone of a noble liturgy, the humble believer adores his God in the Eucharist as he would in vain attempt to do without the aid of that sacrament.

As time advanced the theory of Paschasius Radbert slowly and silently gained ground. A century and a half of comparative quietude suffered this discussion to be forgotten, until the monastery of Bec and the learned world in general throughout the West began to practice debate with weapons, which were new to them although they had to be cleansed from the rust of a venerable age. Arabian scholars like Avicenna, having become enthusiastic readers of ancient Greek philosophy, were instrumental in introducing it through Spain into Europe, where it speedily took root and flourished greatly. An occasional work or idea derived from the same primary source, was also borrowed by the Latins

from Constantinople and the mediæval Greeks. A new philosophy took possession of the Western mind, and sought to explain, prove, and systematize all Catholic theology. It revered Aristotle as its august founder, but had a lower niche at one side for the statue of Plato the Divine. The Stagyrite, by means of the efficient help afforded him by men of such colossal dimensions as Lanfranc and Anselm, Roscelin and William of Champeaux, Abélard and Bernard of Clairvaux, Peter Lombard and Alexander of Hales, Bonaventura and Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus and Roger Bacon, governed Spain, France, Germany, Italy, and Britain autocratically from the eleventh to the fifteenth centuries, and still controls no small portion of Christendom. Logic, proceeding according to the rules of Aristotle, was held capable of attaining infallible results. The citation of a sentence or an opinion from that philosopher carried oracular weight. The whole attention of the age was given up to metaphysical discussions which hardly had a beginning and never could come to any conclusion. Yet this unprofitable war of wits exercised the intellectual faculties, produced a more general thirst for knowledge, developed many prodigies of acuteness, vigor, and fertility, erected many a stupendous monument of erudition in the vast tomes which were evolved from restless brains, and opened the road for the sounder learning which was to follow.

An irrepressible feeling of regret arises within us when recalling the narrative of the Second Eucharistic Controversy, that the craven-heartedness of the champion who then undertook the defense of Catholic verity robbed him of the praise which otherwise would have been accorded to his very decided ability and noteworthy breadth and liberality of thought. The courage necessary in order to confront an angry concourse does not always accompany noble qualities of intellect; but whenever there is a conspicuous lack of fortitude, the possession of mental vigor only enables a man to make himself more contemptible. Who does not feel that a brain as mighty as that of Galileo should have strengthened his heart against the terrors of the Inquisition? Yet had that philosopher fallen a victim to theological rage, he would have died in behalf of a discovery important enough to science, but of very little consequence as far as man's eternal interests are concerned; and so we are disposed to urge, in excuse for his recantation of what he firmly believed to be astronomical

truth, the plea that it is hardly worth while for a man to sacrifice himself in such a cause. Poor as such an excuse must seem to every one who perceives that all martyrs to truth are martyrs to their own moral integrity, it utterly fails us when the persecuted person has weakly shrunk from suffering in behalf of so vital a doctrine of religion as that concerning the nature of the Holy Communion. He who denies the faith denies the Lord who taught it, and shares the guilt of Peter, and especially so when his denial touches the truth of the Incarnation as nearly as does the sanctioning of a dogma which, by necessary implication, destroys the reality of the glorified body of the Saviour, by dividing it into millions of fragments to be devoured by as many mouths. Whether, or not, unqualified condemnation is the due meed of every one who swerves from truth under intimidation, most assuredly nothing else can be expected by him who prefers his own ease and safety to the maintenance of that which God has made known for the sake of lost sinners, thereby seeking to rescue them from eternal destruction. Even an Athanasius might have failed to check the rushing tide, but he would at least have given the just cause such prestige as a glorious example could afford, and saved the orthodox from the shame and disgrace in which they were involved by the pusillanimity of the champion whom circumstances forced to the front.

Happy in having enjoyed the instruction of so competent and paternal a master as Fulbert of Chartres, and in the possession of leisure to indulge his fondness for the pursuit of knowledge, Berengarius had already acquired some distinction as head of the cathedral school at Tours, and as archdeacon at Angers, when he commenced to animadvert upon the doctrine of Radbert. As soon as it became known that he was opposing the views of the Eucharist which were daily growing in popular favor, a storm began to brew. The offense of Berengarius was an almost unpardonable one in the eyes of his former friend, Lanfranc: it was that he refused to credit the conversion of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, and adhered to the reasonable view that the only change was a figurative one, admitting that some transaction occurred at the celebration by which the benefits of Christ's atoning death were communicated to the faithful, but holding that it occurred in the spiritual world only. Lanfranc was scarcely less than furious, and his powerful enmity caused

matters to go hard with the archdeacon, procuring for him unheard a condemnation by a Roman synod held under Leo IX. in 1050, and a citation to appear before a council which was to meet the same year at Vercelli. Upon requesting from the king of France permission to obey the summons, he was seized and ignominiously consigned to a dungeon, and deprived of his goods by sequestration. Two ecclesiastics, who had the courage to appear as his advocates, had to be arrested in order to protect them from the rage of the mob. Berengarius was again condemned. Eusebius Bruno, his own bishop and fast friend, and others, procured his release, but advised him to moderate his zeal. Finding in his own firm conviction assurance that his views needed only to be known and ably defended in order to triumph, he refrained, it is true, from advocating them as openly and vehemently as before, but clung to the hope of obtaining for them an impartial hearing before an assembly of bishops. He set out in this hopeful strain to attend a council at Paris, but prudently listened to friendly advice, and thereby saved himself, in all probability, from personal violence, for the council was not satisfied till it had condemned him and his adherents to death. Nothing daunted, he presented himself before another French synod, which was held at Tours in 1054. On this occasion he had the good fortune to be shielded from his bitter opponents by the papal legate himself, who was none other than the redoubtable Hildebrand, prime minister of popes; who became convinced that the views of Berengarius were not by any means as low and ultra as they had been represented. What exactly were the opinions of the cardinal, we cannot say. It is probable, however, that he did not quite coïncide with the accused, although he was far from agreeing with Deoduin of Liege and the extremists on his side; he was too fair-minded and resolute a man to be controlled by the cries of the vulgar, or to unite in any unjust condemnation. Hildebrand had influence enough to bring about an accommodation on the basis of a somewhat ambiguous formula.

Thus far the champion has acquitted himself very creditably indeed, not suffering himself to be disheartened by the mere show of numbers, and at the same time using considerable prudence and moderation in advocating the doctrines which he was persuaded were correct. Hereafter he is to appear at less advantage, though the tragedy opens with his manfully repairing to Rome and invit-

ing the whole Christian world to a thorough examination of his doctrine. Like many another standard-bearer of truth, he did not know his own weakness until the fated hour revealed him to himself. Hildebrand, not caring to hazard what were to him more important interests by committing himself too entirely upon Berengarius's side, was unable to carry his point against the fanatical majority, who were spurred on by Cardinal Humbert. In 1059 the latter forced upon the unfortunate advocate of the genuine Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence a formula so worded as to express the most carnal notions of the Lord's Supper. Returning to France, the vanquished combatant strove in vain to drown his remorse in a lively controversy with Lanfranc, who supported the popular side with remarkable acuteness and power, but without going all the lengths of Humbert and the Italian council. At length Berengarius beheld his protector seated on the pontifical throne, and perhaps hoped that he would now live unmolested. If he nursed any such anticipations, they were soon destroyed, for even Gregory VII., the fearless and utterly indomitable antagonist of monarchs, was not strong enough to rescue this man from the machinations of Cardinal Benno. Berengarius covered himself with the disgrace of a second recantation, and then fled from society, and wept over his cowardice and faithlessness during a period of nearly ten years, reaching from his last condemnation in 1079 to his death in 1088.

Thus the doctrine of Transubstantiation triumphed, and marched forward with steady steps towards its final victory in 1215, when the decree of the Fourth Lateran Council would enthrone it as a dogma of the Latin Church. It could hardly have succeeded in enslaving men's minds so universally but for the extraordinary homage which was paid to the *dicta* of Aristotle, who attempted to divorce substance from phenomena in a most dangerous fashion. Deep thinkers are frequently puzzled in regard to the method of proving that an external world exists. It is often said that no man ever saw a stone. He sees its color, its shape, its size, but not the thing itself: he can feel that it is smooth, round, hard, but cannot feel the thing itself. The *qualities* of matter are all that our senses can be cognizant of, that subtile thing we call *substance* always and forever eluding their grasp. How color, shape, size, smoothness, roundness, hardness, brittleness, and elasticity could continue to manifest themselves after the stone itself were abstracted, we must

leave the scholastics to answer for themselves. Ridiculous as the idea of separating the properties of a body from its substance is to our modern understandings, it is nevertheless one possible to be advanced, and it was, virtually at least, taught by the Stagyrite. Adopting the theory made ready to their hands, the schoolmen elaborated the theological system of eucharistic philosophy, according to which it is held that while the *accidents* or properties of the bread and wine remain, the *substance* has all been taken away, to make room for the insertion of the *substance* of flesh and blood without their usual *accidents*. Such is the solid foundation of this scholastic edifice! What marvel that the doctrine of Concomitance was suffered to minister to priestly arrogance, by taking out of the mouths of God's children the cup of His atoning blood, on the plea that, since no process of pressing or pounding can drive all the blood out of the flesh of slaughtered bullocks, the invisible flesh must retain the invisible blood, and therefore the communicant who eats the consecrated wafer necessarily partakes of the other element, and does not need to have it separately given to him! What marvel, either, that the transubstantiated elements should become so perfectly identified with the Lord Himself that devout souls approach them with that overpowering awe which is inspired by the presence of Deity, and kneel before them as before the Everlasting Throne itself! And what more natural than that the common people should become oblivious of the very precept which was emphasized in the Institution, and instead of eating and drinking the blessed symbols, content themselves with gazing in breathless reverence upon the gorgeously arrayed celebrant, insensible the while to the creeping over them of a deathly faintness caused by lack of spiritual nourishment! Yes! And one needed not to be a prophet in order to foresee that the common sense of the laity would, sooner or later, rebel against such outrage, and demand that their parched lips should be moistened with the wine of Christ's providing. Innocent III. could easily obtain the sanction of the Fourth Lateran Council to a dogma however unsound and pernicious, but he could not prevent the enraged Utraquists and Calixtines of Bohemia from storming the town-house of Prague with a symbolical cup at the head of their columns, nor, under the skillful generalship of John Ziska the Blind, from shattering three successive armies of the emperor Sigismund, who had basely betrayed Huss and Jerome to the flames of Constance.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE LATIN CHURCH TO THE TRIDENTINE ERA.

We have already mourned over the decadence of the Church, but must now steel our hearts for the contemplation of some particulars of the great corruption which almost made one branch of it an offense in the nostrils of all virtuous persons. Deep grief must stir every pious heart in dwelling upon the sad and terrible downfall of those who were mighty in Israel. The more thoroughly we are convinced of the fact that the church of Rome was once the soundest member of the great corporate Church which Christ Himself founded, the more lamentable will sound to us the story of her falling away. Would that we might look back to the Rome of the General Councils without having our view intercepted by the shadow of great darkness which settled down so thick upon the Rome of the Middle Ages! We have seen a Leo stemming the tide of imperial dictation, we have seen a Martin cheerfully sealing a good confession with his blood, and have hailed them as glorious defenders of the true faith. While unable and unwilling to withhold our admiration from the devotion, heroism, and genius of Hildebrand, and while we even venture to sympathize with him in his determination that, if it be true that either the church must rule the state or the state must rule the church, then the sword of temporal domination should be wielded by the hand which already, by divine apppointment and consecration, held that of ecclesiastical sovereignty, we cannot but feel our transports in this case greatly moderated by sad reflection upon the consequences which ensued, as common sense would have taught any thoughtful person to expect, from the establishment of the principles for which he battled. Although contending, with zeal that was scarcely moderate, for a cause which was certainly wrong, Hildebrand was neither an immoral, nor an irreligious, nor a selfish, nor a weak man, but one of the most

devout, virtuous, and able men that ever figured in the high places of the church: he, at least, brought no disgrace upon the papal chair. Still he was toiling to build up a power which would prove itself the deadliest enemy of the very church to which he gave his life. Absolute power can safely be conceded to no human being; for, though on those rare occasions when it falls to the lot of great and good men, it may for a time work immense benefit; on those other and much more frequent ones when it is attained by the incompetent and the vicious, it will enable vice to spread, like the waters of a spring freshet, over all barriers and obstructions, these being perhaps demolished forever. The ends which Hildebrand sought to compass were vast and noble. Near to his inmost heart lay the desire to reform the church, and in particular the *curia* or papal court, and towards the accomplishment of this some of his mightiest efforts were directed. It is true that he aimed at the establishment of a huge ecclesiastical empire, but in his view and intention the whole strength and influence of the gold-encircled tiara were to be enlisted in the cause of true religion and fervent piety. There was need enough of a thorough reformation, for the history of those who successively occupied St. Peter's vaunted chair during the two or three centuries immediately preceding the pontificate of Gregory is simply appalling, as a chronicle of human depravity. Not only was no care exercised in the choice of the men who were to be the chief pastors of Latin Christendom, but the office was openly bought and sold by a pontiff like Benedict the Ninth, who, having been elected at the age of twelve by free use of money, shamelessly disposed of the prize which he had drawn, and then seized it back two years later, in 1047. The advantages attendant upon the possession of such unlimited power were basely employed for the promotion of unworthy relatives, for the advancement of incompetent and untrustworthy favorites, for the annoyance and humiliation of enemies, for the amassing of wealth, and for the furthering of private and unsanctified schemes. Females of loose character played as conspicuous a part as the Pompadour, or the viler countess Du Barry, in the worst days of Versailles while Louis XV. gave himself over to debauchery. The abilities and self-devotion of Gregory VII. and Innocent III. raised the papacy, step by step, towards the highest pinnacle of ambition, but with what effect upon the popes themselves a very cursory glance at the history of the church of

Rome will suffice to inform us. The doubter has only to read an account of the extortions practiced by those popes who, preferring a Gallic atmosphere and the protection of the French king to the hazards of a residence in Italy, where they would be coldly regarded as foreigners, maintained their court at Avignon, in Provence, and forced by all kinds of avaricious schemes and unscrupulous measures from a reluctant clergy some compensation for the revenues which their own proper territories withheld; or of the struggles between rival claimants of the Apostolic See during the period of the Great Schism, which followed close upon the termination of the "Babylonish Captivity" by the return of Gregory IX. supported by the powerful influence of the able nun, Catharine of Siena, to Rome, seventy years after Clement V. had left it. As time advances and the epoch of the Reformation draws near, matters seem to grow worse beneath the darkening heavens. If a brighter day arose out of that mighty convulsion, then was the proverb well illustrated, that the darkest hour precedes the dawn, by the aggregation at that precise time of three such popes as Alexander VI., Julius II., and Leo X. About a century earlier John XXIII. had been deposed by the council of Constance on account of certain crimes alleged against him, as well as for other causes. The black catalogue of offenses includes, as set forth in formal articles, simony, extortion, adultery, incest, the sale of ecclesiastical offices and bulls, and poisoning. If such an enumeration could be eclipsed, that marvel was achieved by the utterly infamous Alexander, whose miserable life was accidentally, but retributively, terminated by a poisoned cup which he and his son, Cæsar Borgia, had intended for other mouths. Julius substituted carnal weapons for the ones proper to spiritual warfare, and bent his energies towards the aggrandizement, by force of arms, of the throne which he had obtained through the basest means, not hesitating to turn against his allies whenever the doing so seemed to promise well for his nefarious schemes; at one moment using the French against the Venetians, and then going over to the other side, and stirring up the maritime republic, and the Swiss and Spaniards against Lewis XII. of France; and lavishing upon the congenial pursuits of camps, battles, and campaigns that time and those energies which had been ostensibly dedicated to better things. His character corresponded with his course of life, so that in this chief-bishop we recognize arrogance

and fierce cruelty worthy of such soldiers of fortune as Wallenstein or Davoust. Leo X. was as much worse than these pontiffs as a polished, scholarly, elegant debauchee and infidel is worse than coarse, vulgar ruffians. In him the bad traits of the Medici blood predominated over the good, and caused him to abandon himself, for the most part, to sensual indulgence. Idle, luxurious, and vain, his literary attainments enabled him to jest with more pointedness against *that fable* of Christianity. When dark shades are altogether used in coloring a picture, we are very apt to question the impartiality of the hand which paints it. Was there no one man during all these centuries whose integrity and purity would show all the clearer for the sombre background? Had there been a single pope of any prominence whose life revived the memory of apostolic virtue and godliness, and whose abilities enabled him to stamp such characteristics, even faintly, upon the church, we would gladly introduce him into the grouping, for artistic effect, if for nothing else. Even if we wished to paint the picture darker than the truth warrants, this end would best be accomplished by resorting to just such a device of contrast. As it is, we are sorely tempted to throw in a dash of warmer hue, to surround Caraffa with a lustre which does not belong to his haughty and imperious character, to dwell upon the three or four weeks during which death spared in Marcellus II. a genuine reformer, to forget the trickery, dissimulation, and excessive pride which tarnished the glory of Sixtus V., and the heartless cruelty of Pius V., his predecessor; but inexorable truth reminds us that, while even Hildebrand harbored passions scarcely consistent with the Christian profession, the vast mass of the Roman bishops were either utterly insignificant or hopelessly bad, not one of them worthy of mention among the luminaries of an earlier period, and some of them so utterly profligate that language could hardly exaggerate their criminality, and that the only compeers for them are to be found in the Neros and Domitians of elder Rome.

A miracle would have been required to preserve the lower orders of the ministry and the other members of the episcopal bench from this contagion. Small care was likely to be exercised in selecting the minor officials of such a debased government. When the keeper of the monkeys could be converted into a cardinal by the papal nod, as was actually done under Julius III.; when an unmarried pope could have six Borgias to call him

father; when the earthly head of the church could allow himself to remove his enemies by poison; when, in short, no species of iniquity was an unusual, or a nocturnal, visitor at the Vatican, what must have been the condition of the clergy at large? Is it strange that a custom should have actually prevailed in some places requiring every parish priest to take a concubine before he was instituted, in order to protect the chastity of the wives and daughters of the community? Is it strange that public men, dignitaries of the church, and all persons, indeed, should have feared to taste the eucharistic cup, where it had not yet been taken away from the multitude? Is it surprising that extortionate measures were employed to replenish their own coffers by a clergy who were continually subject to being plundered by the papal tax-gatherers? The provincial vices may be only faint copies of the more brilliant crimes of the capital; but when debauchery and avarice reign supreme at the source of power, the most distant points will not escape infection.

And, indeed, what could even the most upright and zealous ministry have accomplished when loaded down with such dogmas as the Latin clergy had to carry towards the dawn of the Reformation? Should we choose to embark upon a philosophical inquiry as to what are the chief restraints upon the sinner, we would perhaps conclude that the two considerations which check the believer, whenever he feels himself most powerfully drawn towards evil, are the fear of eternal punishment and the knowledge that this terrible fate can only be avoided by a pardon from a just God. Love may be a more powerful emotion than fear, but its force is one rather of reclamation than of restraint. After the transgression has been committed and the enticement to its commission faded away, then sorrow for having offended a compassionate and long-suffering God and our crucified Lord takes possession of a heart awakened to love, but the overpowering violence of a momentary and passionate impulse easily obliterates, for the time, every trace of affection, and would leave us to fall helpless victims to the temptation, were it not for the terrible warning which fear whispers in our ears. And as for fear's having power over us, to doubt it would seem little short of absurd, unless we could expunge from history the pages which tell how the bravest troops have cast away the record of perhaps ten campaigns, along with their arms and accoutrements, as they have fled with blanched

faces from some peculiarly trying situation. If this be true of advanced Christians, how much more true must it be of those vast multitudes who seem to hover on the borders of righteousness, just contriving to keep themselves from the clutches of the Evil One! Now, the great dread which is inspired by the mention of Hell arises from the utter hopelessness of his lot who is to be cast into its blazing pit. Let it be once understood that the fires of Gehenna are to torture us for a time only, and we will at once become forgetful of their heat in the forethought of our escape from them. In the next place, begin by limiting the time, and go on to provide methods of easily escaping even this graduated punishment by doing penance or paying a certain amount of money, without in any way reforming the life, or submitting the rebellious will, or cleansing the wicked heart, and you surely have made long strides towards the sinner's emancipation from all fear of the hereafter. If any step remains to be made, that, too, will have been taken as soon as we shall have removed our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ from the position which He alone can fill, of Mediator between an offended God and His alienated subjects, and shall have substituted for Him, in the grandeur of His perfect humanity and the glory of His consubstantial divinity, poor, weak, sinful men and women like ourselves, who may be thought susceptible to influences of merely human pity which could not affect the Perfect One. All these successive advances were made by the Latin Church. For Hell, she devised a purgatory; to the doctrine of purgatory, she added those of penance and indulgences; and to these, again, that of the worship of the Virgin and the Saints. What had a member of the church to fear? If he took the very small pains necessary to avoid excommunication, he could only be sent to purgatory, at the worst; if he had left any money behind him, the church would see to it that his heirs should not be slow in buying his release from its mitigated pains; and all this could be accomplished, in almost open opposition to God, through the all-powerful intercession of those saints whom he could so easily propitiate with votive offerings such as formerly were laid on the shrines of heathen gods. Did it not almost seem as though Rome had entered into a conspiracy to overthrow religion? What more could she have done? She had turned loose upon the community a set of disorderly, drunken, profligate idlers, and put into their hands the tremendous engine

of the confessional, and filled their mouths with a doctrine that might have subverted the most approved piety; and she had removed from the people one-half, at least, of the spiritual nourishment necessary to support in vigorous activity the life implanted at the font. Such is the indictment which we present against the Western Church.

That we have drawn it up with a very weak and partial pen, will be charged upon us by those who are at all familiar with the facts of the case. Rome herself cannot deny a single allegation we have brought forward. If she made the attempt, her own doctors, and synods, and popes would give her the lie direct. Her divines demanded a reformation vociferously: Constance, Basle, Trent were the scenes of three tremendous efforts to reform the church *in its head and members;* and popes themselves were frequently compelled to admit the propriety, the necessity, of taking some active measures looking in that direction. What she has so repeatedly, in so many different ways, and with such frankness, admitted openly before mankind, she cannot now deny without infringing the great law of *estoppel*, and bringing upon herself the well-merited contempt of all honest persons.

As our object is truth, and not defamation, we will do well to consider whether no excuses or palliations can be pleaded in behalf of the prisoner who stands at the bar of our judgment. In all honesty, let us confess that there is much which ought to be taken in mitigation of the condemnation we cannot avoid pronouncing. Even under the assumption that the crimes of the Church of Rome were as black as the most fiery imagination can paint them, fairness forbids our laying them unqualifiedly on the sturdy back of that ancient corporation. The fact seems to be that Christianity had deteriorated, sadly, in the mass. That close interdependence of religion and civilization which is natural and inevitable had been enlarged and strengthened by that unfortunate act of distrust in God, of which the Church was guilty when it rose to the shining bait which Constantine cast upon the water. The religious capability of any man, or any collection of men, must depend upon the intellectual and moral status of the individual or community, and that, again, must oscillate with the advancement or retrogression of civilization. Where a people is hardy, brave, abstemious, and cultured, the average of piety must be much higher than it would be under the contrary condition of affairs. When a nation has

allowed itself to become lazy, luxurious, ignorant, and profligate, generations must elapse before it can be brought up to a high-toned morality. Had the Christian Church only possessed prudence, foresight, faith, independence, self-control, and courage enough to remain in the position in which Christ had placed her, she might have preserved her own people from degenerating with the subjects of the Empire. By instilling the divine precepts of revelation, and hedging in her kingdom with those rules and ordinances which she might have found it expedient to enact, she might have constituted herself the guardian of learning, philosophy, refinement, and even of material comfort and mechanical skill. In so doing she need not have descended from her own sphere, since her commission extends to the salvation of the race, not only from the pangs of eternal torment, but also from all the injurious consequences of sin, among which may be enumerated its tendencies towards indolence, self-indulgence, and vice. But when she gave her hand to an imperial suitor, she subjected herself to all the vicissitudes of his household. From the day of their union it was certain that the fall of the empire would terribly shake, if it did not utterly destroy, the visible kingdom of heaven. Her influence was insufficient to stay the downward progress of the secular power, which was already dying of inner rottenness. Effeminacy and foreign invasion, in immersing the empire of the Cæsars in a vast ocean of ignorance, darkness, and utter ruin, enveloped the kingdom of Christ in the fogs of superstition, doctrinal error, and immoral living. It is not, therefore, just to charge the church of Rome with the necessary consequences of a fault in which the whole Church participated. The age itself was a corrupt one: the Latin church shared in this corruption, partly, it is true, from the inherent necessities of the case, but chiefly by reason of the unholy alliance by which the Catholic Church had needlessly involved herself in the catastrophes of the State.

If it is unfair to throw the entire blame for the demoralization of society upon the Latin church, it cannot be proper to depict that sad condition as being more complete and universal than it really was. In reading ordinary Protestant accounts of that period one feels as though truth and righteousness had perished out of the land, and it had been entirely given over to riot and all iniquity, and left to wallow in the slough of abandoned impiety.

If any vestiges of sanctity remained, we are instructed to search for them exclusively among the inhabitants of certain favored Alpine valleys and perhaps of a few other districts in the south of France, who rejoiced in the names of Waldenses and Albigenses, and enjoyed the double distinction of having been denounced as heretics and exposed to the horrors of crusade and inquisition. But who does not know the proneness of man to exaggerate? Were there, indeed, no faithful parish priests who tended their flocks with assiduity, and guarded them with unwavering diligence, where the blue waves of the Bay of Biscay and the rugged fastnesses of the Asturian Mountains protected them from too close intercourse with a decaying civilization, where the impregnable fortresses of the Rhine shielded an industrious peasantry from foreign exactions, where the sturdy Saxon nourished in his sea-girt isle those sentiments which gradually embodied themselves in that charter of freedom, the English Common Law, or even in the very heart of the papal domain itself? The idea is monstrous! Was Luther the only man of his generation who sought the Lord with all his heart? No more than he was the first one to raise an outcry against the prevailing immorality. Wycliffe had preceded him by a century and a half, and been quite as outspoken and fearless as he, Huss and Jerome had followed the Englishman, Tauler and Ruysbroek had trodden the same rough and dangerous path, Savonarola had hurled his fiery eloquence at the "Nero of the Pontiffs," Lord Cobham had suffered on the gibbet, and yet we are to think that the Latin church was wholly corrupt! John Gerson, the foremost theologian of his age and, at one time, chancellor of the Sorbonne at Paris, together with another chancellor of the same university, Peter D'Ailly, boldly advocated reform, though retaining unimpaired their fellowship with the church; pope after pope proclaimed the necessity of restoring ecclesiastical affairs to greater purity; council after council was held at the demand of irrepressible public sentiment in order to bring about that desirable consummation; and yet we are prohibited from believing that the entire Western Communion was not thoroughly, totally, and irreclaimably corrupt! Why! the very success of Luther and Calvin is proof positive that the age was ripe for a change, and therefore that the mass of the church had been working towards a reformation for at least a century or two previously. Or shall we credit the pre-

posterous notion that the wonderful preaching of two or three men aroused all Europe from a dream of wickedness, and drew hundreds of thousands, almost upon the instant, into the paths of virtue and correct doctrine? Not a few cardinals,—men of note, like Caraffa, Contarini, Morone, and Reginald Pole,—belonged to a confraternity organized at Rome itself under the name of the "Oratory of Divine Love," and strove, by intercourse with each other, to promote piety and devotion among themselves and, less directly, among others. Could this have occurred in a Christendom that was as far gone from holiness as some would paint it? Could the majority of eighteen thousand ecclesiastics demand reform in head and members, if the church were wholly corrupt? Yet that number was assembled at the great reforming synod of Constance, which sat from 1414 to 1418. Bad as pope, and clergy, and people may have been, erroneous and pernicious as may have been many of the dogmas commonly taught, some virtue and some piety must have survived, down to the era of Luther, in that vast and powerful section of the church which acknowledged allegiance to the patriarch of Old Rome.

Let our glance now be turned upon the doctrinal condition of the Latin church, with a view to ascertaining whether the prevalent errors were merely of a floating and adventitious nature, or whether they were ingrained in the system of the church so as to be part and parcel of its own substance. That the departures from the purity of the faith were flagrant, and injurious, and numerous has already been admitted with sufficient minuteness and distinctness. Some of these errors, such as those of Transubstantiation and Purgatory, had already received the sanction of councils and been openly taught as the Catholic faith. This surely was sad enough, and yet there existed no insurmountable barrier between membership in the Roman church and adherence to the primitive faith, all that was exacted of a catechumen in order that he should be admitted to holy baptism being, in respect of faith, the profession of the ancient creeds. No man was compelled to believe in the physical transformation of the elements, in the theory of concomitance, in the existence of a purgative fire, in the propriety of worshiping the Virgin or the saints, or in the possibility of being more than sufficiently righteous. It might expose him to much discomfort and even to some degree of danger, if his conscience should oblige him to oppose these errors

openly, but he might reject them himself and still honestly retain his standing in the Romish communion. After the Tridentine period this became impossible, but down to that date the case was precisely as stated above.

What was the effect upon the status of the Latin Church of these erroneous teachings and of vicious practices? Having carefully traced the lineage of the Western Church to the time of her separation from the Eastern, and for some centuries later, we may perhaps be justified in putting the question, When did she cease to be a living branch of the one great, divinely-founded corporation-ecclesiastical? After preserving her identity so long, how did she come to lose it? Did the Fourth Lateran Council stab her fatally with the dagger of transubstantiation, or the Council of Florence with a formal definition of purgatory? Will some one inform us just how much error in matters of the faith is required to extinguish the ecclesiastical candle? While our friends are engaged in the quest of the amount, we will hazard the affirmation that as long as the Apostles' Creed is retained and used as the baptismal formula, no amount of doctrinal aberration, however excessive, will cause a church, which administers the sacrament of new-birth in the name of the Trinity and by a valid ministry, to cease being a church and become a mere voluntary, man-made society. When a corporation has once been organized under a charter, that charter continues in force till it has expired by natural or express limitation, been voluntarily surrendered by the surviving members, or revoked by the authority which granted it. Inasmuch as the Latin Church has never surrendered her charter, or had it revoked by Christ, it only remains for us to inquire whether there are any limitations, either implied or expressed, in the wording of the document. None such appear on the surface other than those included in the conditions that she must retain a ministry whose commission proceeds from Christ Himself, and that this ministry must baptize with water in the name of the Trinity; conditions which Rome has always sedulously fulfilled. If absolute correctness of belief is requisite for sonship in the family of God, then no man ever yet belonged to that family. If a church perishes the moment it swerves from the straight line, few have prolonged their existence many decades. The Scriptures, and particularly the Book of Revelation, clearly imply that a church can err greatly both in faith and practice, and still be a

church. One might about as properly argue that a man loses his identity when he catches the small-pox, as insist that a church loses its identity by becoming corrupt. Peter continued to be Peter through the threefold denial and the ensuing repentance: so the seven Asiatic churches were still acknowledged to be churches while St. John was being bidden to reprove them for unfaithfulness. There is also abundant language in the Apocalypse which indicates that the mystical Babylon was to be an organization which, though apostate, would nevertheless be a real church. A church is one thing, a society another: nothing imaginable can convert a mere human society into the Church which Christ built upon the Rock; and on the other hand, incalculable force is required to wrench from its foundation an edifice which the hand of the Master has planted on the granite. Indisputably the Roman church was so planted, and we may rest assured that she is a *veritable church* to this very day. Does it seem a question of no consequence whether she is so, or not? Men are very impatient, at present, of all argumentation intended to show that an organization, which is extremely corrupt, still retains its corporate identity. This state of mind is excusable enough. When a man lies disfigured, polluted, dying with some nauseous disease, the ordinary spectator listens with feeble attention to the praise of his noble qualities and unusual abilities. What difference can it make that through his veins flows the pure blood of the highest ancestry, that blood being poisoned with the deadly fever virus? Better and happier is the dullest boor whose cheek wears the hue of health than a Newton or a Bacon whose brain is filled with the wild fancies of delirium. But let us suppose that our patient recovers, that the enfeebled mind regains its tone. What then? Is the peasant still as valuable to society as the sage? The vast distance which separates the one class from the other cannot be obliterated. The uncultivated mind may be greatly improved by careful education, but the lack of mental power can be supplied by no imaginable means short of a new creation. The sick man may not betray his brilliant endowments to a casual observer, and certainly derives small advantage from them himself while they are rendered nugatory by disease: nevertheless he has fallen heir to a great inheritance, and if he can once escape from beneath the cloud, will be at liberty to enjoy it, and to lavish his wealth of thought and imagination upon the enraptured world. Sons of men become

the sons of God, with titles to the riches of eternity, by being baptized into His Church: they may rebel against Him, and temporarily forfeit their titles; but they remain His children notwithstanding, and do not fall back into the condition from which baptismal new-birth raised them. The children of wrath can strive with any amount of diligence and perseverance to serve their Creator, but remain aliens to His kingdom and family until they have been born again of water and of the Spirit in the font of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church. A number of men may band together in order to accomplish certain purposes; but until the society has been recognized by the state in which it exists, it possesses none of the rights and privileges of a corporate body, cannot hold land, sue or be sued, nor enter into contracts or agreements. Millions of earnest believers may organize themselves into a religious society, but that society has no status in the spiritual world till it has been openly chartered by the Almighty Ruler, no matter how good its members may be, how sound its constitution, or how pure its faith; while, on the contrary, a regularly chartered church remains a *church* through error, confusion, and vice, at least until its very foundations are torn up.

While the great bosom of Latin Christendom was heaving with the violent emotions which attended upon its struggles after reform, Rome herself was compelled to recognize the need of improvement. After several of those sections which remained loyal to her had held provincial synods which attempted to move in that direction; after the Gallicans had met at Paris in 1528, and Hermann of Cologne had assembled a reformatory council in 1536; she perceived the necessity of taking some steps herself for the confirming of her own children's minds. In 1545 began the almost interminable sessions of that great council which hardened into permanent dogmas so many viscid opinions that might otherwise have been, in course of time and by the providence of God, drained off into the abyss from which they had been vomited. The Reformation obliging the Romish Church to move, there were only two directions in which she could go; and as she would not follow the Reformers in their advance towards virtue, and piety, and truth, she could only rush still deeper into immorality, impiety, and error. When this so-called *general council* of Trent, packed with creatures of the papacy, had dragged its slow length through eighteen years, its members turned their faces homewards, having

embodied most of the leading errors of Romish teaching in authoritative dogmatic statements, which were soon to receive the official sanction of a papal bull. Before the Creed of Pius IV. had been issued and made binding upon the consciences of the faithful, there was a possibility of remaining within the Romish Communion and yet rejecting all tenets contrary to the primitive faith; but that unfortunate document, by imposing as terms of admission twelve articles which involved the acceptance of the errors of purgatory, invocation of saints, indulgences, transubstantiation, and other false doctrines, shut the door of the Romish Church upon all such as should be unable to reconcile these with the Scriptures and the testimony of antiquity. From the year 1564 onwards the status of the Church of Rome has been materially changed, on account of the enforcement of the new Creed. It is not fair to judge of her at the era of the Reformation by what she has become since through the counter-reformation, which gradually converted into her very substance what had previously clung, as extraneous matter, to her skirts.

That inextinguishable hatred should reign between Catholics and Protestants is more natural than commendable. Hereditary enmity is very apt to disregard the metes and boundaries of reasonableness, moderation, and Christian charity. Time has been when a man's piety was measured by the intensity of his hostility to Rome, and the volubility with which he was accustomed to denounce every practice, good, bad, or indifferent, of that church: then there was no sin which could not be atoned for by unsparing denunciation of the "Babylonish Harlot;" hatred, not charity, being allowed to hide a multitude of transgressions. Color might be found even at this day for the opinion that, in some quarters, the same gauge is still used. Now, there is nothing more impetuous and thoughtless than rage, and of all species of animosity the most violent and uncontrollable is that kind which busies itself about religious matters. The mutual dislike of Catholics and Protestants is the outgrowth of a prolonged and very bitter struggle. First came the religious war of Germany, which set brethren face to face on many a bloody field before Maurice, going over to the side of the Reformers, chased Charles V. across the Tyrolese mountains and wrested the Peace of Passau from Ferdinand. The Protestant Netherlands, after groaning for years under the tyranny of Cardinal Granvella, and the still heavier oppression of that apt and

able tool of a bigoted prince, the duke of Alva, after seeing their noblest citizens die the ignominious deaths assigned to Egmont and Horn, after enduring as long as they could all sorts of civil exactions combined with the barbarities of the Inquisition, at last formed the alliance of Ghent under the influence of William the Silent, and then entered upon a desperate war with their Spanish sovereign. What horrors fell upon that devoted land during its heroic effort to free itself from foreign oppression, the heart shudders at recalling. Towns sacked as only the brutal and licentious soldiery of a despot such as Philip II. could sack them, cruelties perpetrated such as it required the education of the Auto-da-fé to inflict, a whole country submerged by the piercing of the dykes, the assassin-hand of a religious fanatic slaying the prince of Orange in the royal banquet-hall of Delft at the instigation of priests; these things left their impress behind them. When shall the Huguenots of France forget the jubilee ordered by the pope on receiving the news of that horrible massacre which laid low in death the gray-haired Coligny and twenty-five thousand, at least, of his brethren, in the brief space of three days? The transactions of that awful night, when Charles IX. amused himself by firing upon the Calvinists, have not only coupled the name of St. Bartholomew and the year 1572 with the blackest infamy, but were sufficient to load any cause with execrations. In order that the flame of hatred might not die out, the duke of Guise and the Holy League were careful to keep France embroiled with its best citizens in a contest which either smouldered on, or blazed fiercely out, until La Rochelle had at last submitted, and five hundred thousand exiles carried the memory of their woes into other climes. Even England was not suffered to repose quietly in the environment of her four seas. The insult of Philip's attempt to subjugate her might be forgiven in consideration of the total failure which made the "Invincible Armada" a standing jest in history, but the intrigues of the Jesuits and the Gunpowder Plot are not so easily to be condoned. The Thirty-years' War was enough by itself to have left sores that would rankle for centuries. The Catholics must, in any event, have learned to hate more utterly the cause which drew down upon them an ice-floe from the North just when their generals had brought the Protestant Estates to their feet, the cause which inundated Germany with the pious hosts of the heroic Gustavus Adolphus, which encouraged the

Chancellor, Axel Oxenstiern, to continue the struggle after that chivalrous monarch had paid the penalty of his daring, which gave strength to the arms of Banér, Bernhardt of Weimar, Torstenson, Wrangel, Turenne, and the able leaders who contributed their skill, bravery, and devotion towards the final triumph attained by the Protestant allies in the Peace of Westphalia; and these, on the other hand, must have experienced a growing detestation of a religion and its adherents which seemed to countenance the ruthless, unscrupulous, senseless pillaging and cruelty of Tilly and Wallenstein, and gave Germany over to a desolating warfare which depopulated, as well as devastated, it during an entire generation.

As long as the terror of Rome affrighted the nations, there was considerable excuse for indulging in feelings towards her which savored of vindictiveness. Shall we still confess to entertaining such dread of her collapsed power? Shall we nurse an enmity more bitter than that which was stirred up between England and France by Cressy, Poictiers, Agincourt, and the burning at the stake of the saviour-maid? Or shall we not cherish more Christian sentiments, and strive to quench the unappeasable strife? Let us, at least, be just, if not generous. Let us exclude from our hearts that blindness of prejudice which sees nothing whatever of good in an enemy. Let us bury, as far as prudence will permit, the recollections of past persecutions and fights. Rome is not to be won by fierce denunciations, nor will the interests of true religion be subserved by painting a foe blacker than the truth warrants. Bad as that church may be, perverted as may be her moral sense, purple as may be her hands with the blood of the saints, polluted as may be her lips by the kissing of idol shrines, is there not within her still, even down to this late day, even now that the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and of Papal Infallibility have become *de fide*, "the promise and the potency" of something better in the future? With her magnificent organization what a church would she not be, could she only be purged from her errors and vices, and brought back to a veritable Catholicity!

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE CONTINENTAL REFORMATION.

Luther was not so much more successful than the numerous reformers who had preceded him, on account of any deep-laid plot, which he had deliberately undertaken to execute, and in the accomplishment of which he expended the energies of an unchangeable will; but because circumstances forced upon him the leadership in a great movement for which the age was ripe. Endowed by inheritance with a robust and active nature, firm in his convictions, and resolute in maintaining them, he was marked by destiny as the man in Europe whose huge hand should shiver the fetters which shackled the members of Christ. He did not assail Rome; but she turned her engines of war upon him, as he stood among his own sheep, watching over them while they fed. A weak man would have crouched before the storm, or rushed to meet it half-way: Luther remained at his post, and blenched not when the pitiless hail burst upon him most furiously. Only while his friends held him captive in the fortress of the Wartburg, did he even seem to avoid danger. With equal fearlessness did he burn the papal bull at Wittenberg and confront his enemies in the diet of Worms. To withhold from him the praise of honesty, high ability, dauntless courage, and unusual self-devotion were grossly unfair; to pretend that he was actuated by low motives, such as those of obstinacy, pride, and sensuality, were a libel against human nature. At once a scholar, a patriot, and a Christian, the friar of Erfurt is, and deserves to be, the foremost figure of an age distinguished by such names as Charles V., Francis I., Henry VIII., and Cardinal Wolsey. His faults were those which seem almost inseparable from the vocation to which he was called, and may be summed up in the allegation that he was an *extremist.* Perhaps had he been anything else he would have failed, for those only appear able to contend successfully with the force of long-

established custom whose convictions possess such overwhelming strength that they themselves are swept helpless along with the rushing tide.

Yet the question before us is not as to Luther's honesty, ability, or provocations. However much we may sympathize with him in his noble struggles to free a groaning and suffering people from spiritual tyranny, or value the good results which did flow from his heroic perseverance; however difficult it may be to discover any way by which he could have escaped from the dire calamity of an entire breach with the Church Catholic; however proud we may be of his victory over a hierarchy which was on the point of riveting upon the limbs of prostrate Christendom the chains of perpetual slavery; we must nevertheless perceive that an entirely different matter from any of these claims our attention; which is simply this, Was the sect or denomination which Luther founded a genuine Church? This is a pure question of fact, with which sentimentality has nothing to do. If the Lutheran organization, when perfected, was a branch of that corporation which Christ chartered, then was it a real church; but if not, —if it was a mere society created by man's will,—then, no matter what excuse its members and founders may have had for breaking away from the communion of saints, no matter how admirable may have been its platform of belief, its laws and regulations, and its mode of worship, no matter how pious and earnest may have been the children to whom it gave birth, it was not part and parcel of the Church of Christ. The hot-headed partisan never listens to an argument concerning aught upon which he has thoroughly made up his own mind, but customarily takes refuge behind abusive epithets. The philosopher, on the contrary, having discovered that he is quite capable of arriving at wrong conclusions upon almost any subject, and that his most cherished opinions have often been shattered under a well-directed blow as completely as the Prince Rupert's drop is said to be, holds himself ready to examine anew almost any topic, when courteously invited to do so by a reasoner who merits attention.

The inquiry which is now forcing itself upon us being so extremely distasteful, let us, for a moment, turn aside from it, and look with careful eye upon the doctrinal position of the great German reformer, not with a view to discovering whether it varied in many particulars from the faith of the undivided

church, but rather to determining whether its fundamental principle be not one fatal to sound doctrine and opposed to all certainty of hope. The Latin Church had laid, for many centuries, too much stress upon the idea of paternity in government, seeking to keep her children in perpetual pupilage, forbidding to them the free use of the Bible and requiring them to take the law altogether, with abject submissiveness, from the mouth of the priesthood. This, of course, was a great overstraining of her authority. Did she desire to make babes of grown men? Luther was far too much of a man to submit to any arbitrary edicts which would drive from its proper throne in his mind that Understanding which is the responsible guide of every one's actions. He asserted the dignity of his manhood; but forgot to break off at the right point. In rebelling against tyranny, he lost sight of rightful authority. His teaching hands over to each individual the entire right of forming his own judgment upon any religious topic, without regard to the opinions of divines, the solemn decrees of councils, or the unanimous testimony of Christians. Church authority over the human mind was theoretically reduced to nothing. However ignorant and stupid, however vicious and depraved, each man was competent to decide the knottiest questions in the science of theology. No knowledge of letters, no aquaintance with geography, history, or languages, no experience in the pursuit of virtue, nor familiarity with holy thoughts was at all requisite in order to expound dogmatic teaching, apply prophecy, or remove apparent inconsistency. And as for hearkening to the Spirit of God speaking through the corporate church, or even relying upon the witness borne by the many independent provincial churches to the faith as once delivered to them, those were exploded notions of mediæval Romanism not worthy any longer of so much as a sober thought. Is there, then, no medium between slavish subjection and unbridled license? Did these Reformers indeed perceive how radical was the change that had been introduced? Surely, they could not have realized that it was cutting away the very ground from under their feet, by removing all possibility of proving the inspiration of the Bible. Strange result of an effort to loose the four angels from the chains which held them bound on the banks of the Euphrates! It is honestly intended to restore the sacred volume to its just place in the veneration of Christian people; and the well-meant attempt ends in reducing

that book to the status of an ordinary production of literary skill. Nor did the new movement conduce to reverent handling of the Scriptures; unless it be more seemly arbitrarily to eject the epistle of St. James as being an "epistle of straw,"—because it might be supposed to contain a different doctrine of justification from that which had been put into the mouth of St. Paul,—than to add certain books to the canon without due warrant. When Carlstadt and others insisted on carrying the right of private judgment further than was pleasing to his more chastened soul, Luther had an opportunity of discovering the true nature of his theory, and perhaps bethought him, when contemplating the wild aberrations of the fanatics, that a man is likely to reap what he sows. The Lutherans themselves may never have run into any extreme latitudinarianism or eccentricities of belief; but ought not to use that fact as a conclusive reply to what we are urging, until they can show that the existence of the fact is not itself due to the restraining influence of those who have adhered to that good old rule of Vincent of Lerins which they have thrown away.

Returning now to the main inquiry, we are constrained to confess that we are unable, even after the most diligent search, to discover one single argument to support the claims of the Lutheran body to be a real church. Intentionally or unintentionally, the German Reformers did create a new society, which was not continuous with the old in any important respect, but one which, while composed largely, or almost entirely, of those who had been members of the other, was governed by different regulations, ruled by officers who lacked official confirmation, and in general based, not upon any divine charter, but upon the unsanctioned and independent action of mere men. If there is any truth whatsoever in the theories which have already been propounded and supported with what seemed to us conclusive reasoning, a church without a bishop, if it be a church at all, cannot survive the death of those who have received ordination from episcopal hands before the separation which deprived it of apostolic superintendence. The Lutheran ministers, at first, had the power of baptizing and of consecrating the elements, because they happened to have been regularly ordained to the priesthood within the Romish communion; but all of them together could not make even so much as a deacon, since the charter of the church provides only for *episcopal* ordination. Consequently, the clergy in the second generation were

destitute of all delegated authority, and had fallen to the level of mere representatives of the people. A church without a ministry must be without the sacrament of the altar, and is in a bad enough case; but that is not the worst aspect of the position. A Spanish provincial synod has been made to do duty for an œcumenical council, and even establish, against the whole current of primitive catholicity, the validity of lay-baptism; but there is required more than the authority of Elliberis to uphold a principle which is really fatal to the whole theory of a church. We need not in this matter fear to take a stand which will bring down upon us the storm of popular ridicule: there is a chance here for another Athanasius, if our age can produce one. England never gave birth to a clearer intellect or a sounder judgment than were possessed by Daniel Waterland. Who would not rather be "wrong" with Bull or Waterland than "right" with the unthinking mass, especially when one considers that the "errors" of those men are almost sure eventually to assume the fair features of truth? The arguments of Waterland, of Lawrence before him, and of Ogilby since, have never been satisfactorily answered. Kelsall was a mere child in the embrace of his gigantic antagonist. Bingham, of course, favored the same side, but who would think of pitting him against the invincible Waterland as a profound reasoner: the learned compiler would show to poor advantage in such a contest. If the palm of victory is to be torn from the grasp of Dr. Clarke's great adversary and conqueror, the champion has yet to enter the lists. Until his appearance we may, without presumption, openly range ourselves under the ensign of a man whose opinions have received increments of weight with each successive generation, confident that, however unpopular may still be this particular one, the happy day will, sooner or later, come which shall behold a wonderful change. The burden of proof lies upon the opposite side,—if, at least, any success has attended our efforts in evolving a theory of ecclesiastical organization and continuity; for the entire authority and power to convey divine grace reside, according to our theory, in the regularly commissioned ministry. That an exception exists in the case of baptism is a startling assertion, and one that requires to be thoroughly substantiated before we listen to it; and until something more forcible can be adduced than the decree of an obscure synod, or the practices of churches in which the reins of discipline have been sadly relaxed, we feel little dis-

posed to remodel an hypothesis which explains all other facts, from the era of the Apostles to our own.

But suppose, now, it should be found that more than one bishop has received no baptism other than what has just been shown to be none at all, will not then the whole fabric of the Apostolic Succession be destroyed by the Invalidity of Lay-baptism? How so? What difference does it make to any one but himself whether any bishop has been baptized? This is a question of authorization, and if God authorizes a person to act for Him, the validity of his acts is not at all affected by the personal state or condition of the man himself. It may be ill-advised to appoint officers over a society who are not members of it, but that certainly can be done. Should the discovery be made that the United States minister at the court of the Czar is not a citizen of the Republic, that irregularity would not shake the validity of his representative acts within the just scope of his powers. Would the Supreme Court reverse a decision because it had been rendered by a Chief-justice who was an alien? Although the Constitution especially provides that the President shall be a natural-born citizen, even in such a case of plain ineligibility the judges would probably hesitate to pronounce all the executive acts of a whole administration overturned by the unfortunate circumstance that the individual, who had been formally and solemnly recognized, who had duly taken the oath of office and held the position for the entire term undisputed, was born, say, in Cuba! Very excellent reading, in this connection, would be the general law of Agency. In short, *any human being* who has been duly *appointed*, or whose appointment has been explicitly recognized, by the Almighty, is qualified to act for Him, and his acts will be efficacious; whereas none other is so qualified, nor will his acts hold. Saul was king of Israel, Balaam was a prophet of God, Caiaphas was high-priest, Judas was an apostle; each of them, irrespective of unrighteousness, because he had been duly authorized as God's agent in the duties of his office. Whether ever ordained to the priesthood, or not, whether ever made a deacon, or not, whether a communicant, or not, whether confirmed, or not, though even unbaptized, and even though the most wretched of all criminals, if a man has been consecrated bishop by a bishop in the true succession, bishop he is, and bishop he will remain till he dies; and his official acts will not be nullified by the misfortune of his

having been himself an alien from the commonwealth of the true Israel.

We are aware that the title of *Churches* was commonly conceded to both the Lutheran and the Calvinistic bodies by English churchmen of the time of Hooker the Judicious, and regret the necessity of differing from men for whom we have such deep veneration, and to whom we owe such a debt of gratitude for having transmitted to us the privileges we enjoy in the fellowship of the Catholic Church; but do not feel ourselves in any way precluded, by modesty or deference, from calling in question the correctness of the views they formed upon such a *quæstio vexata*, in the heat of a terrible struggle. The English Reformers were great and good men, but, unless they had been infallible, could not at once and completely have emancipated themselves from the bondage under which the mind of Christian England had so long writhed. The question of the *Church* was perhaps the one upon which they were the most likely to be perplexed, it being in many respects, as presented to them, an entirely new one, and one, also, in the decision of which their sympathies and prejudices would come most powerfully into play. We need feel no astonishment that they allowed their antipathy to Rome, and their dread of her great and threatening power, to drive them into closer relations with others who were contending against her usurpations, than was justified by the attitude in which these chose to stand towards the Church of Christ. At the same time we ought to be careful that we ourselves, with the superior advantages we enjoy, especially in not being exposed to dread of papal tyranny, should take broader and calmer views upon this momentous topic.

If it is urged against us that the Reformed and Lutheran communions have contrived to get on very well without ministry, sacraments, or settled faith, have nurtured many an orthodox theologian, have enrolled many a glorious name in the list of the saints, and have contributed liberally of men and money towards the work of carrying the glad tidings to heathen lands, we protest that these facts have been full before our mind, from the very first. Undoubtedly the Holy Ghost has been poured out upon the members of these societies in no stinted measure: to deny it would be little short of committing the unpardonable sin. Yet we do not see that this acknowledgment weakens us very much. We do not shrink from any proper test,—nor from every improper one. Had

God made comparative piety the criterion of a church's claims, we would not despair of being able to designate at least some few characteristics of *churchly* piety which stamp it as being of finer fabric and more enduring substance than any other. Fortunately, however, the gracious Lord puts no such invidious task before us as that of computing and comparing the kinds and degrees of righteousness and holiness in rival communities or organizations; but reserves that for His own omniscience, allotting to us the far easier one of deciding the question of *historical continuity*. If a man desires to know whether a given society is the Church of God, he needs not to wear out his life in futile efforts to estimate its comparative moral worth, but has only to inquire whether that organization derives its corporate being from the primitive and apostolic Church, which Christ's own hand was to build upon the Rock of Ages.

The reformation which was begun in Switzerland by Ulric Zwingle and Œcolampadius, carried forward, after the former had fallen on the field of Cappel, by Oswald Myconius and Henry Bullinger, and then given over to the able management, first, of the Frenchman, William Farel, and afterwards of his more distinguished countryman, John Calvin, was far more radical in its nature than that instituted and established by the Saxon school. Though lacking the breadth of mind required to grasp truth in its many-sidedness as presented in the Catholic faith, Calvin possessed amazing acuteness of intellect and extraordinary talent for organizing. In mental constitution, he was almost a model Roman of the Empire,—logical, shrewd, persevering, and above all, systematic. The religious philosophy which he devised was as devoid of feeling as one of Aristotle's syllogisms. The system of church government which he erected at Geneva, and imposed upon all his followers as the only Scriptural mode, was altogether the product of his fertile brain, never having been so much as dreamt of till he came upon the stage. Whatever palliation or justification may be found for Luther's establishment of a separate ecclesiastical organization, none such will avail a man who sets up a wholly-new device of his own, and labels it *Scriptural*. No trammels of tradition, precedent, or custom restrained the impetuous reformer of Noyon, who deemed himself competent with his own hand to carve out a faith and a church better than those which had been so greatly prized, and ably and zealously defended,

by Polycarp and Cyprian, Ambrose and Chrysostom, Athanasius and the Gregories. Calvinism may have vitality enough to insure its long continuance on earth in the future, but has not enough to enable it to trace its origin back of its founder. Should it yet endure ten thousand years, the stubborn fact would still confront it that it began to be in the sixteenth century, and then sprang, not from the Latin Church as a daughter from her mother, but from the restless intellect of a French refugee, like Minerva from the travailing brain of her sire.

Alas that the highest qualities of head and heart are seldom bestowed upon the same individual! Had Luther and Calvin only possessed the calmness and breadth of Melancthon and Erasmus of Rotterdam, or had these last been gifted with a little more of the independence and energy which characterized the two former, how different might have been our verdict upon the status of the reformed communions!

CHAPTER XIX.

THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

Proximity to the vast, changeful, heaving, boisterous, beautiful, mercilessly-powerful sea seems necessary in order to the development of the very highest powers of man. In the narrow strip of land which lies along the eastern border of the Mediterranean, lived and thrived the people of David, Solomon, and Daniel. Between the sea-washed shores of two peninsulas arose the two mighty nations of antiquity which extended their sway over three continents. Far north of Greece and Rome, in a latitude which would be scarcely habitable but for the ameliorating influence of the Gulf Stream, surrounded by tempestuous oceans, which dash furiously against cliff and bar, and enveloped much of the time in dense fogs, Celtiberian mariners early discovered twin islands, a residence in which appeared to them so desirable as to lure them away from the delights of their own romantic Spain. It was the fate of England to be frequently overrun and conquered. After the Anglo-Saxons had driven the original Britons into Wales and Cornwall, they were themselves grievously harassed by Danish freebooters, and then subjugated by the Normans. The earliest historical conquest of the country was by the Romans under the Emperor Claudius, nearly a century after their first invasion of the island under Julius Cæsar in 55 B. C., but they did not attempt to resettle it except so far as to establish an occasional camp or colony. Two, at least, of these conquests, the Anglo-Saxon and the Norman, were about as thorough as conquests could be, expelling and exterminating the defeated tribes or reducing them to a miserable condition of servitude. It might be thought that national enmity and caste pride would have prevented intermarriages. Not so. Briton, Angle, Saxon, Frisian, Dane, Roman, Norman overcame every scruple, and sought matrimonial alliance, with small regard to any other considerations than

those of interest and impulse. Thus there grew up a race hardly less composite and vigorous than its language, and seemingly heir to the best qualities of all its ancestors. The earliest inhabitants, indeed, are reported to have been unwarlike, and generally imbecile; but quite the reverse seems to have been the truth; and no such allegation, at all events, can be brought against the valorous German invaders, those fearless sailors and dauntless pirates, the Danes, nor the disciplined and gallant followers of William the Norman. The descendants of such races were not likely to practice tame submission to tyrannical authority. Favored by its insular position, which protected it, in a measure, from the interference of its neighbors, the nation which resulted from the commingling of so many streams was enabled to turn its almost undivided attention towards the consolidation and confirmation of its government and power, and to the perfecting of its institutions. One of the first European countries to rise from the general wreck of the Middle Ages an independent and organized nation, England soon became the home and hope of civil liberty. How much ecclesiastical freedom was likewise indebted to her, let it be our pleasant employment to ascertain.

The church was planted in Britain very early. In 314 the bishops of York and London were present at the council of Arles, and in 305 St. Alban was beheaded near Verulam, a martyr to the true faith. But the early British church was involved in the ruin of its adherents, being driven with them into the fastnesses of the western districts of the island. Woden and Thor usurped the deserted altars, and the greater portion of England embraced once more the dream of the Scandinavian mythology. The Saxon Heptarchy was pagan throughout, until the marriage of Ethelbert, king of Kent, with Bertha, a Frankish princess, introduced Luidhard into the realm as her chaplain, he being a bishop of her own country, and likewise encouraged Gregory the Great to send the prior of a Benedictine monastery at Rheims, with forty of his brethren, as missionaries to the blue-eyed "*Angels*" of the North. The task before Augustine, when, in 597, he landed on the shores of Kent, was nothing less than that of converting a heathen nation, for the only effect that the Christianity of the defeated race had had upon the conquerors was to create within their breasts hatred and contempt for a religion which had suffered its votaries to be so completely overthrown. There was no act of intrusion

upon the part of the monk or his master, for the Saxons had taken good care that the jurisdiction of the British bishops should be confined to their own people. Scarcely the remotest chance existed that those prelates would ever have the slightest influence over the haughty and supercilious victors. No sound reason forbade any foreign bishop, who might imagine that he saw a fitting opportunity, to enter and take full possession. The interest which Gregory manifested in the spiritual welfare of the fair-complexioned islanders did him much credit, and the bravery and self-devotion displayed by the missionaries themselves ought to secure for them a tribute of gratitude from all loyal members of the church which they founded, and of which their leader became, by the consecration of Vergilius, bishop of Arles, and the investiture of the Latin patriarch, first archbishop.

Ireland had been approached by the missionaries of Rome at a much earlier date. Palladius, the first envoy of Cœlestine, did not meet with much success, but the famous St. Patrick displayed such zeal and capacity for the work that the natives were won over in flocks, so that in the fortieth year from the time of his coming he was enabled to found the archiepiscopal see of Armagh. This was in 472. In 565 there issued from the youthful church of Ireland a man hardly less distinguished than its own Apostle, and actuated by the same evangelizing spirit. Thirty-two years before the Roman monks landed on the Isle of Thanet, St. Columba had erected the standard of the cross among the northern Picts, the southern Picts having long before welcomed St. Ninias, a Briton, within their borders. Columba converted the kingdom of Bridius, the son of Meilochon, and established the celebrated monastery of Iona in an island ceded him for that purpose. Somewhat later, at the invitation of Oswald, king of Northumbria, the pious Aidan took possession of an island which was to rival in ecclesiastical renown that Iona he had forsaken so reluctantly. With great propriety was the seat of the new bishopric named Lindisfarne, or Holy Island. In planting it so that with one ear it listens to the deep roar of the surf, and with the other to the lowing and bleating of numerous herds and flocks; with one eye sweeps far and wide over a boundless expanse of blue, and with the other describes the curve of a beautiful and cultivated shore from a bold promontory which lies seven miles, or thereabouts, to the south as far as the mouth of the Tweed, which

is about the same distance northward; nature seemed to intend it as the abode of those whose high calling it is to stand between time and eternity, the living and the dead; and well did the pious characters and saintly lives of many of its children justify the choice of it as the site of a second monastery.

The subjection of the Saxon Heptarchy to the rule of Christ was neither a short, nor an easy, work. However, from the two centres of Canterbury and Lindisfarne emanated influences which little by little encroached upon the realms of the Walhalla, and at last drove the fierce gods of the Northmen into temporary exile. But the arrogant pretensions of Augustine's successors were no more palatable to the Irish bishops and monks than his own had been to the British whom he met in conference at the Oak. They refused to surrender their independence or sacrifice their dignity, and prospered under the divine blessing so greatly that they brought Northumbria and Mercia under the yoke of the Gospel, and even extended their lines so far to the southward and eastward as to embrace the territory of the East Saxons. But the prestige of Rome soon proved too strong for them, enabling the Kentish princess whom Oswiu, king of Northumbria, had married, to carry her husband and his people over bodily to the Roman side, in spite of the stout resistance offered by Colman, the third bishop of Lindisfarne. Thereupon that dignitary, with many of his clergy, retired from the scene of his discomfiture into Ireland; while others remained and conformed to the new rules and practices, among whom was Tuda, who became the fourth and last of the Scottish incumbents of Aidan's see. His recusancy is partially excused by his having been educated in the south of Ireland, where different influences are said to have prevailed from those which were dominant in the north. About 670 Archbishop Theodore, metropolitan of all England, a Greek by birth, a Latin by preference, a master of learning, and an adept in organizing, the introducer of his native tongue, and the founder of the English diocesan system, a chief agent in saving England from the isolation which has proved so pernicious to Ireland, and in binding her to European intercourse and civilization, virtually extinguished the last remains of the Northern independence, not, however, so totally but that there lingered courage to resist unusual papal usurpations. Wilfrid, bishop of the Northumbrians, having dared to appeal to Rome against a sentence of deposition and then re-

turn to claim his see, was seized and thrown into prison by his king, Egfrid. A second appeal against a second sentence, followed by another papal acquittal, failed to secure his reïnstatement under Egfrid's successor. Thus early did the English Church begin to assert its rights; for the clergy stood by their civil rulers in this affair.

With the incursions of the Danes, came the necessity for renewed efforts at evangelizing, for the predatory barks of the Vikings still sailed under the auspices of the Valkyrias. King Alfred's political foresight, as well as his religious earnestness, rendered him very urgent with those of the defeated invaders who wished to reside within his territories that they should submit to being cleansed from the pollutions of idolatry in the waters of holy baptism. A treaty was effected by which Guthrum, Alfred's own godson, was permitted to govern his Danish countrymen who had settled in East Anglia. Forsaking their roving life, many of these greedy and merciless pirates became peaceable and industrious citizens, and established themselves in colonies wherever they could obtain a footing. They gradually lost the manners of their forefathers, and exchanged the wild fables of the Norsemen for the sure hope of eternal life. But paganism was destined to make one more inroad under Sweyn the Fortunate, who had expelled from Denmark the clergy whose labors his father had favored. While enriching himself with the plunder, and amusing himself with the miseries, of the fairest portions of England, he lifted his hand against the faith of the poor, oppressed people. Nevertheless, it is reported that a late repentance at length overtook him, and caused a total change in his policy. His son and successor, the renowned Canute, who wore upon his brows the double diadem of Denmark and England, was not only a Christian himself, but did not cease his assiduous efforts to propagate the true religion till he had brought his own paternal realm into the confederacy of Christian states.

When the consecrated banners of William the Norman waved victorious upon the field of Hastings, Alexander II. perhaps congratulated himself upon having brought another kingdom to his feet in servile submission; but if so, he had sadly mistaken the character of the Conqueror. The ancient Anglo-Saxon church, which had survived all the Danish invasions, had been founded by his illustrious predecessor, and had inherited from the Bene-

dictine monks sentiments of thorough loyalty and of profound reverence for the chair of St. Peter; but this did not satisfy the haughty potentate, who had waxed so mighty in his self-esteem that he felt himself the visible representative and earthly vicegerent of Almighty God. The equally haughty Norman had no objection to any amount of papal blessing, would doubtless have accepted another kingdom, had it been offered him at a similarly easy price, and might even have allowed the commissioner of the pope to sanctify his very shoes, had the pontiff been Hadrian IV. and made him a gift in fee-simple of Ireland; but facile as William could be in such matters, he was tenacious enough about retaining both his property and his rights, when once he had gained them. He was not the man to become voluntarily and unnecessarily the vassal of any one: so when Gregory VII. ventured to demand not only Peter-pence but the performance of homage to him as liegelord, William allowed the money to be collected as proper ecclesiastical dues, but gave the pontiff to understand that he did not consider him as his master, and would not perform fealty to him. Notwithstanding this bold refusal, the reign of William I. was upon the whole decidedly favorable to growth of the papal pretensions, both directly by giving bishops independent jurisdiction over certain classes of causes which had previously been adjudicated by the earl and bishop sitting together in the county court, and indirectly by breaking down the free institutions of the Saxon code and putting others in their stead which promoted the interests of tyranny. The Saxon Stigand was obliged to make room for Lanfranc as archbishop of Canterbury, and the other prelates were also deprived, Rome taking care that those instituted in their sees should be wholly subservient to her.

In the reign of Henry II. were enacted the Constitutions of Clarendon, with a view to preserving some degree of independence among the English clergy. Thomas à Becket, the archbishop of Canterbury, interposed a sturdy resistance on behalf of Rome, but paid the penalty of his misdirected zeal when he fell a victim to royal anger and courtly sycophancy on the very steps of the altar. The results of this horrible deed were the canonization of the martyr, the abolition of the Constitutions and a withdrawal of the prohibition of carrying up appeals to the patriarchal throne, and a substantial victory for the papacy.

It not infrequently happens that too great eagerness to im-

prove a success converts it into a defeat. Innocent III. pressed hard upon John Lackland, a weak and worthless ruler, insisted upon his right to control the election of an archbishop, and asserted it by putting the whole realm under an interdict. That a brother of the Lion-hearted Richard should have tamely resigned his crown into the hands of Pandulph, the papal legate, and stooped to receive it from him again as a vassal of the Roman see, is simply astounding. No wonder that the barons turned away their eyes from the sickening spectacle, and then, under the leadership of the noble archbishop, Stephen Langton, and his brother in renown, William, earl of Pembroke, advanced with steady step towards the civic triumph of Runnymede, which gave England her Magna Charta, a document of hardly less importance in ecclesiastical than in secular annals.

The task of defending English liberties from foreign aggression was one in which other church dignitaries besides Langton delighted to share. That prelate achieved his great success in 1215, a date memorable in history. A few years later the see of Lincoln was honored by a bishop who, through the weight of his example and the direct influence of his writings upon such men as Wycliffe and Huss, perhaps deserves to be called the father of the Reformation. Great as a scholar and thinker, and greater yet as one who did not flinch from speaking out at the biddings of conscience, even when his utterances were sure to be distasteful both to the general laxity of the age and also to the insolence of autocratic power, Robert Grosseteste rebuked the vices of his times, and disregarded the excommunication of Innocent IV.

The succeeding century gave birth to a man well-worthy to follow in the footsteps of Robert "Greathead." Master of all the learning of his time, and particularly strong in biblical knowledge, John Wycliffe soon discovered how far in many respects the received theology had strayed from catholic truth; and, being an earnest, religious, high-souled man, felt his spirit burn with righteous indignation at sight of the hollowness of clerical zeal and piety, the prevailing wickedness of the commonalty, and the oppressive practices of those in authority. He began by vehemently denouncing the vicious and luxurious lives of the clergy, then opened a sustained fire upon the papal militia, the ubiquitous, intrusive, and meddlesome friars, and finally (a diplomatic visit to Bruges which brought him into close intercourse with the

nuncios of the pope having produced on him a similar effect to that which was afterwards wrought upon Luther by a short sojourn in the metropolis of Christendom), turned his heavily-shotted guns full upon the papacy itself. Not content with these achievements, he gave the English people the Bible translated into their own tongue, earnestly exhorting them to read it, and even exposed the gross error of transubstantiation. It was with difficulty that he escaped from the bitter malice of the numerous and powerful enemies whom he created for himself by assailing wrong as every soldier of Christ is bound to do, and especially by reviving the hated opinions which had almost made a martyr of Berengarius. However, he died peacefully on the last day of the year 1384 at his benefice of Lutterworth, to which he had been presented by Edward III.; a fate which possibly would never have been his had not attention been diverted from his agitations by the Great Schism which began with the death of Gregory XI. The insurrection of Wat Tyler, on the other hand, might easily have proved fatal to him, as it would have been only natural for the government to have taken the same view which has since been adopted by the learned and judicious Hallam, of his having been partially responsible for that tremendous movement. His opinions survived, not only in the sect of the Lollards, but as a leaven working throughout the Latin church and hastening the period of emancipation from spiritual thralldom. To him, it may be, the Continental Reformers owed at least as much as the English Church was ever indebted to Luther or Calvin.

Throwing now a retrospective glance over the history of the English Church from its foundation to the time of its severance from Rome, we are sensible of a deficiency in our proof. It is one thing to protest against encroachments, and another, and often a very much harder, thing to ward them off. That bold spirits were found among the descendants of Hengist and Horsa, of Alfred, Harold, and William, to lift their voices in denunciation of tyranny, redounds greatly to the glory of the country that gave them birth. But in order to persuade ourselves that they succeeded in maintaining the independence of the insular church, we would be compelled to forget not a little which, however unpleasant to recall, we yet all too well know to be matter of fact. The English, it is true, contended against the wretched practice of conferring benefices upon non-resident foreigners; but did they

prevent its continuance? They struggled bravely against the equally objectionable custom of transferring causes to the papal court: did their threats of inflicting the pains and penalties of a *præmunire*, or of being proclaimed an outlaw, deter condemned ecclesiastics from appealing to an extraneous tribunal? However gallant was the resistance offered by the Throne, Peers, Commons, or Church of England, their efforts fell far short of such achievements. If the English Church was not part and parcel of the great Latin Church, bound up with the others by those various ties which consolidate different national communions into one great corporate body, we might despair of being able to point out any, except the Italian, that was a portion of it. Look at France, with her "Gallican Liberties" fenced in by the Pragmatic Sanction of St. Louis (IX.)! See Charles VII. replacing this document with another which was even more pronounced in its assertion of national rights, and then Philip the Fair dispatching the able lawyer, William de Nogaret, to seize that ambitious and powerful pontiff, Boniface VIII., and bring him prisoner to France! And, shocking to relate! behold the iron gauntlet of the lawyer smite heavily upon that proud head! Was France, which set up, and thrust down, the puppet-popes of Avignon, a part of the Romish church, and was not England, which would have cut off her right hand rather than have so dishonored the Apostolic See?

The Church of England has little reason to be proud of the monarch whose hand broke the fetters that had so long chafed her; for a man who does not hesitate to murder a wife by judicial process as soon as he desires to be rid of her, may be a learned, and able, and popular sovereign, but must remain, for all time, in the eyes of Christian people, a monster of iniquity. That the utmost ingenuity of the most skillful historian will ever succeed in erasing the stain of such an atrocious fact from the biography of Henry VIII., it can hardly be presumptuous to doubt. It must also be clear to the reflective mind, that labored attempts to whitewash his character only rebound against the church in whose interest they seem to be made, and injure her reputation by giving color to the strange and utterly unfounded notion, that it is a matter of very great concern to her that his escutcheon should be untarnished. What was Henry VIII. to her more than any other monarch? If God is mercifully pleased to overrule the bad pas-

sions of evil men so as to make them subserve His own divine purposes, what is that to us? Henry neither made, nor undertook to make, the reformed Church of England; he quarreled with Rome and compelled his realm to unite with him in the quarrel: that was all. Thus the wickedness of the king measured itself against the wickedness of religious usurpation, the contention enabling the down-trodden Church to take one long stride towards freedom. Out of evil came good. Shall we say that good so derived is not good? We are forbidden to do evil in order that good may come, but not to obtain what benefit we can from evil that is unavoidable. Henry arrogated to himself a very high-sounding title as earthly head of the church, and the two convocations were forced to concede much of his claim; but we cannot think that the divine favor was forever forfeited by recognizing the civil ruler as "Head of the Church and Clergy, so far as the law of Christ will allow;" which was the utmost that could be extorted from the two Houses.

We need not, however, conceal our regret that such a concession was ever made. It was a pity to take up a fresh yoke the moment the old one was discarded. Yet the yoke was only nominally a new one, for ever since Constantine the churches everywhere had borne it upon their necks. The great defect of the Anglican Reformation was its Erastianism. That ecclesiastical causes should be tried before judges, who may be devout churchmen, but may also be anything else; that bishops should be elected and consecrated at the imperious dictation of a prime minister; and that laws should be made for the government of religious affairs in a parliament that may be largely composed of Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Heretics, is surely not the condition in which the Master intended that His kingdom should exist. Though the life of the Church is not destroyed at once and inevitably by falling into such bondage, it must be impaired and seriously imperiled.

In the sixteenth century it was not even conceived possible that a religious organization could preserve an independent, and yet friendly, attitude towards the civil government. Two inherently antagonistic conceptions had the ground all to themselves, the one that the State has the right to control the Church, the other precisely the reverse of this. The latter was the grand papal theory of Hildebrand, and was slowly fighting its way

towards absolute dominion over the minds of all zealous churchmen. The only theory which was strong enough to dispute possession of the field was the one so attractive to monarchs who were striving with all their might, and with all the resources of political scheming, to erect permanent and magnificent kingdoms upon the ruins of the overgrown baronies which, in feudal times, set at naught the authority of sovereigns and did not hesitate to meet them with hostile arms. Out of the clashing of rival theories was gradually being evolved greater freedom of thought and liberty of action. In England, at least, were slowly growing up institutions and laws, which would presently transfer the control of public affairs from the hands of a few to those of the great mass of the nation, and protect the humblest citizen from the insolence and oppression of the most powerful. During the centuries between the Conquest and the Reformation, the Commons of England were fighting their way inch by inch into importance and power; the noble system of the Common Law, the condensed common-sense of generations, codified by many of the best, purest, and most practical minds that any bar ever boasted, was gradually being perfected; and the great heart of the people was being trained into a due sense of the value of civil liberty. Hardly any reign was less favorable to the development of free institutions than that of the mighty tyrant who made his power felt in a Europe that was being converted into a theatre upon which might be displayed the prowess of such giants as Charles V. and Francis I. Henry VIII. set his foot upon the neck of prostrate England, and held his sceptre in a grasp of iron; and yet Henry dared not to break the laws. He might override them most execrably, he might threaten judges and bully parliaments, but the dictates of his selfish and willful heart had to get themselves executed in some way that recognized the formal validity of the statute-book. The popular movement slowly went on. A succession of Henries would either have crushed out its life or stung it into such madness that the throne would have been cast prematurely down; but father and daughter, even though that daughter was the patroness of Essex, failed to do more than temporarily check its advance. Slowly reviving under the Stuarts, the Spirit of Liberty struggled hopefully on through the Rebellion and the Restoration, welcomed the Revolution, and despaired not through a long period of official corruption, till at last she saw

herself enthroned far above the nominal seat of the house of Hanover.

Is it to be supposed that liberal thought conscientiously abstained from intruding upon the territories of religion? If Henry's utmost strength could not overthrow the bulwarks of civil liberty, could he have seriously retarded the progress of ecclesiastical reform? How strange a notion is that so commonly entertained, that a single resolute mind can mould a nation and an age! Had England not been ready for a breach with Rome, what would have come of Henry's action, any more than of any one of the numerous quarrels in which the Pope had been engaged with almost every portion of the vast realm over which he claimed paramount jurisdiction? If Henry made the Church of England, surely Mary unmade it in her turn; so that it arose afresh under Elizabeth, and may trace its pedigree from her. Say that Henry had continued in the course he was smoothly pursuing when he won for himself from the Pope the proud title of Defender of the Faith, in reward for a book which he composed in support of the Romish sacramental doctrine; and had bent all his tremendous energies towards the suppression of every symptom of revolt from papal domination which might show itself among his trembling subjects; does any one believe that, even under such adverse circumstances, the plant of religious independence would never have taken root in the insular soil?

As it was, did not Henry rather delay, than hasten, the work of reform? Was not, for example, his tyrannical enforcement of the doctrine of transubstantiation even more injurious to the church than his denial of the pope's supremacy was beneficial? Did not his arbitrary measures sow seeds of contention among the different parties into which churchmen soon banded themselves, that a gentler and wiser hand would never have scattered? Must not incalculable evil have resulted from the needless controversies and strifes into which Cranmer and Gardiner led their eager partisans, and for what did they really fight but for the favor of their terrible sovereign? It certainly cannot be, by any means, sure that, had matters been allowed to drift quietly along in their natural channels, without the interference of the King, the Church throughout the extent of England would not presently have attained a condition of more perfect reform than it has yet reached, and that too with less delay than marked the progress it did make. If it

be objected that all this is mere conjecture, we reply that conjecture on one side is as good and permissible as on the other.

In defense of Henry's conduct two considerations may properly be urged. In the first place, having been carefully trained in a school of which his disposition fitted him to be an apt scholar, and having learned to exercise his ingenuity in discovering arguments on both sides of every question; having been nurtured in a profound reverence for law, and yet taught to treat the most solemn enactments as plastic material to be moulded by his dialectical skill, the royal Tudor, although he might play havoc with the spirit of human or divine law, was watchful not to transgress the letter, according, at least, to his own interpretation of it; entertaining an implicit confidence that he would be permitted to entrench himself behind the logic of the schools, even when summoned before the Last Tribunal. In many ways was this peculiarity manifested. Those whom he designed to punish were convicted according to due legal form, instead of being privately assassinated or publicly executed by royal mandate alone. If it be greatly to the credit of English public sentiment that the tyrant was obliged to observe the forms of law, is it not equally to the praise of English morality that he thought it necessary to trouble himself about ceremonies of another sort? If the king was merely the licentious brute that many would paint him, it is at least deserving of passing notice that he thought it worth his while to remove one woman out of the way before he took another. Was the immaculate virtue of the palace so astonishingly lynx-eyed that no less troublesome path was open to the wandering of royal inclinations? A hint at least concerning *marriages of convenience* might have reached him from across the Channel.

In the second place, it is hardly too much to affirm positively that the monarch of England had the right upon his side in the dispute which led to the breaking out of hostilities. The question was one which involved the title to the succession. The misery and carnage of the Wars of the Roses had only lately been ended, to the great relief of all parties, by the famous victory of Bosworth field. Was the land once more to be deluged with its own blood, because "courageous Richmond" had been too solicitous to strengthen his throne by the continuation of an alliance with the royal family of Spain? Catharine of Aragon was the lawful wife of Arthur, prince of Wales, the eldest son of Henry VII.

What right, then, had she to be joined, upon the death of her husband, in holy matrimony with his younger brother? None whatever according to the Laws of England, the Canon Law, and, not impossibly, the Law of God. Nevertheless, a papal dispensation was obtained from Julius II. permitting the marriage to take place, and it was solemnized accordingly. Such a connection was void *ab initio*, and must always have been considered so by sound theologians. Was the pope indeed able to abrogate the divine law? The shortest-sighted must have foreseen the strong probability that the reign of the daughter born of this union would be an extremely troubled one. Was it not an age rife with commotions, and in which pretenders were ready to start up at the briefest notice? Would not such a flaw in the title breed pretenders? Warham, archbishop of Canterbury, had opposed the marriage from the first. The universities of Cambridge and Oxford, and a large number of foreign universities which had been consulted at the suggestion of Cranmer, pronounced it invalid; as did many distinguished individuals, among whom were Œcolampadius and John Calvin. It is impossible, therefore, to evade the admission that Henry's side was a very strong one, and that regard for the peace of his posterity, the welfare of his country, and the honor of himself and his family, would have impelled the most righteous and prudent sovereign to prosecute the inquiry to a definite and final issue, if such could by any possibility be reached. Had Catherine only been young, beautiful, attractive, and as fondly beloved as Anne Boleyn, our sympathies would doubtless have been powerfully called forth for the young and ardent lover who, through no fault of his own, had found himself wedded to his brother's widow, and obliged to move high and low, far and near, in order to satisfy himself that he had a wife and not a mistress. And why should not our pity, at least, be granted Henry even under all the circumstances? If we picture to ourselves that magnificent Prince in the glory of his youth, matchless for strength and beauty, must we not feel that when his heart had been laid on the altar of state policy, a sacrifice had been made not less than that which the virgins were accustomed to lament yearly upon the mountains of Israel.

There is a busy and exciting scene which can be witnessed on any of the great rivers used as highways for the transportation of timber. Somewhere in the middle of the stream is piled a huge

heap of logs, flung together in the wildest confusion, and offering to the mad rush of waters an unaccustomed impediment, against which they hurl themselves with fury, boiling and surging as they fall back and then sweep past. The insecure island, shivering now and again beneath the blows which are dealt it, swarms with hardy river-men clad in bright-colored flannel garments, dextrous in wielding the axe and cant-dog. Immense trunks roll over and over in response to well-directed efforts, plunge into the current, and are borne away. Logs which are so tightly held that they cannot be disengaged, snap and crack under the sharp-edged axe. All the labor seems in vain, for the other logs which are perpetually floating down from above add to one side of the "*jam*" as fast as the other is diminished. Hours may be thus spent, no visible progress having been made, when suddenly every shirt, red or blue, will be seen springing with all possible speed towards the ready bateaux, like quarry-men running from a blast. Woe to him who is a moment too late! The largest trees lift themselves with butt in air, stand an instant perpendicular, and then topple over, falling with a noise like distant thunder; and the whole mass, slowly getting under headway, yields to the pent-up current, and goes on sporting in its wild merriment towards the next obstruction. When the right log had been dislodged,—the one single log which, having first caught upon some projecting rock, had formed the nucleus around, beneath, and over which innumerable others had collected,—every river-man knew that it was time to leave the trembling mass. This is a parable. In Mediæval times there was one grand obstruction which interposed itself whenever agitation was made for reform. Were objections urged, against superstitious phraseology which had crept into the liturgy, or idolatrous practices which had fastened themselves upon the ritual, these must not be altered without permission from Rome. Were charges preferred against the clergy, of conduct inconsistent with the discharge of their sacred functions, the ægis of Rome was extended over them. Were petitions presented by those who suffered from exactions or felt themselves aggrieved by the withholding of their rights and privileges, they must not be granted till the pope had approved them. Did some independent thinker desire to examine any mooted point of divinity upon its merits, let him beware that he did not seem to question the correctness of any papal utterance with regard to it! The one log

upon which the entire mass rested was that of the Papal Supremacy. When the random blows of Henry had shaken that loose, the whole pile of abuses, errors, and corruptions began to move off. The breaking of *jams* is often a very dangerous business. So many of the prime movers in reforming the English Church found their undertaking, and not a few of them were almost literally broken and crushed by the tossing and grinding mass; but that mass, once started by the removal of the original obstruction, could hardly choose but break up and be carried away.

It was as though in Henry's reign a sudden recession of the the waters revealed the hidden impediment with unusual clearness. The dispute was not an ordinary one between King and Pope, which must of course involve a strong tendency to dispute the latter's claims, but it was of such a nature that the very point at issue vitally affected the Roman position, the question being, Can the Pope annul the canon law so as to sanction an incestuous marriage? Instead of taking a firm, bold stand, as the occasion demanded, Clement VII. practiced the wiles of state-craft, and thereby complicated matters exceedingly. To have distinctly refused to hear anything impugning the course of his predecessor, who had officially approved the marriage, would have given Clement strength with that party which looked with disapprobation upon what they deemed the criminal levity of a young libertine; but to vacillate between a desire to conciliate Henry and the fear of offending Charles, was to show plainly of how little real value in determining important questions was that expensive, arrogant, and boastful hierarch, the pretended successor of St. Peter, and consequently to pave the way for throwing off his yoke. While Clement was dallying, Henry was winning over public sentiment to his side, inducing members of parliament to sign that extraordinary petition in which they affirm the justice of the king's cause and demand, almost with peremptoriness, a favorable decision, and generally influencing his realm against the dilatory and time-serving prince of the Vatican.

The great barrier was at last thrown down and men's minds allowed to revert to genuine catholicity. What a deliverance was this! A sad period was it in church history during which the fountain of truth was walled up and fast locked from the inquirer, and all men were obliged to quench their thirst at the turbid and unwholesome stream of garbled doctrine. A blessed thing it was,

too, for the English Church, that her taste had not become so perverted by long deprivation of pure water, that she preferred to hew out cisterns into which she might turn the filtered current, rather than to imbibe the liquid crystal that flowed through the appointed channels. Fortunately, her appetite was not seriously vitiated. She showed how deep still was her love for the Divine Teacher by returning at once, the road having been opened, to His own blessed instructions, as given to the saints of the Early Church, and by them taught, both orally and by writing, to those that followed them. She had no desire to build up systems of her own, into which she need incorporate only such views of truth as pleased her; nor did she display that overweening confidence in herself which often prompts the intellect to evolve doctrine out of its own inner consciousness; but was glad to receive doctrine and dogma from the hands to which Christ Himself had entrusted them. *Reverence for Antiquity* has always been the crowning glory of the reformed Church of England, her great safeguard, and the distinguishing feature of her divines. And why are these always ransacking the treasures of the Early Church? Was it because they were deficient in learning, in acuteness, or in independence of mind? Had Pearson insufficient knowledge? Was Hooker a feeble-minded person? Did Bull lack vigor and ability? Or was Dr. Waterland unskilled in handling the weapons of debate? Nay, but these divines, these erudite, deeply pious, courageous, original, and profound leaders of the Anglican Communion, had wisdom and humility enough to see that the witness of God's Church is a surer guide than any other.

The way in which the rejection and denial of the Pope's Supremacy produced a reform of doctrine, can be most properly illustrated by referring to the case of Transubstantiation, the greatest and most glaring of all the errors under which Latin Christendom lay groaning at the opening of the sixteenth century. For years after Henry had cast loose from the Church of Rome, this tenet continued to be held as firmly by the English Church as by the most violent Ultramontane. From Henry and Cranmer down to the rank and file of the Christian army, all men marched under this banner. If there did soon spring up a sect of *sacramentarians* who disputed the corporal presence of Christ in the Eucharist, Lambert discovered to his sorrow that it was not safe to advocate such a theory openly, for, after a learned discus-

sion before the King, in which Cranmer himself participated, the unflinching disputant, silenced but not convinced, was burnt under circumstances of peculiar barbarity. This disgraceful occurrence took place several years after the yoke of Rome had been cast off, but before the leaven of free inquiry had had time to work upon men's minds. Twelve years more were destined to elapse while the pious, learned, and moderate archbishop of Canterbury should be advancing through the stages necessary to be gone over in purging his creed from the sacramental follies of the Lateran council. In the meanwhile, there had arisen in the person of the bishop of Rochester, Nicholas Ridley, the ablest theologian that had yet appeared upon the scene, who, by diligent study of Holy Scripture and careful perusal of the early Fathers, had reached a clear and definite conclusion, which he possessed both courage and skill enough to maintain against all comers. His influence over Archbishop Cranmer was that of a strong and resolute will upon a vacillating one, and it can hardly be doubted that, in this matter, he led the way for his weaker and less original coädjutor. While Bishop Ridley can hardly lay claim to the credit of having *discovered* the true view of the Eucharistical Presence which had been hidden behind the veil of Mediæval superstition, there may be conceded him the high praise of having *newly* discovered, and dared to reässert, the hated doctrine, which had so nearly proved fatal when preached by Wycliffe in an age not yet ripe for revolt from papal domination. As long as that authority upheld the decrees of the Fourth Lateran Council and the numerous rescripts and bulls which favored the same view of the Eucharist as that which it promulgated, how was it possible to refute that doctrine publicly and yet remain in communion with Rome? In the privacy of his heart, in the bosom of his family, amid a small and select circle of friends, or even in the seclusion of an obscure parish, a man might treat the Vatican decree as invalid, and the dream of a material change as a figment, without being impelled by his conscience to break off his connection with a church which was really catholic, notwithstanding her fault; but let him not force his unwelcome tenets upon public notice unless he wished to awake the impatient thunders of the new Jove! Independent indeed must also have been the mind which, under such adverse influences and amid such heavy discouragements, could undertake the task of original research. Little enough was there to tempt

one from the safe and easy paths of deference and slavery into those harder ones of free inquiry. But when once the great barrier of absolute papal authority had been crushed beneath the iconoclastic hammer of England's angry monarch, the first keen eye which swept along the right line of investigation with searching glance was sure to see that, if transubstantiation was to depend upon the countenance of Scripture and primitive testimony for its foundation, it must be content to vanish into thin air with the baseless fabric of many another dream. The eagle eye of Nicholas Ridley caught sight of the real cloud-base, and dilated with prophetic joy as it beheld even that dissolving into nothingness. The bishop pointed out what he saw to the slower vision of his illustrious superior, and the twain, together with that untamed, but heroic, spirit, Hugh Latimer, bishop of Worcester, represented it to the church at large, and with such good effect that in the reign of Edward VI. all signs of adherence to transubstantiation at last disappeared from the liturgical and doctrinal formularies of the English Church.

Along with this great leading false doctrine fell many another, never to rise again except during the few years that the sceptre was held by that unfortunate daughter of Catherine who, looking instinctively towards her mother's native land for support to her own tottering throne and unpopular religion, gave her hand to that strange bigot whose name will ever be linked with execrations as that of the oppressor of the Netherlands, and with ridicule as that of the author of the "Invincible Armada." It was a short-lived triumph that Romanism enjoyed under "Bloody Mary." The doctrines of purgatory, the worship of saints, images, and the Virgin, auricular confession, priestly absolution, indulgences, and penance, as well as those of transubstantiation and the pope's supremacy, prevailed from the death of Jane Seymour's son till Cardinal Pole and his royal mistress dropped almost simultaneously the sceptres of Canterbury and of England; but they had been gradually eliminated from the standards of the church during the two preceding reigns, and were to be finally ejected as soon as the vain, though able, daughter of Anne Boleyn should feel herself securely seated upon her father's throne.

Much has been said and written concerning the influence of the Continental Reformers upon the contemporary movement in England. While Henry's iron hand guided the helm of state,

overtures were made to him by the Protestant Princes of Germany to join the Smalcaldic League on the basis of the Augsburg Confession. Melancthon was consulted by the English leaders: he was invited to visit the country. Bucer, Peter Martyr, and many others transplanted their doctrines into the kingdom; while Jewel, Cox, Coverdale, Knox, and a large number of refugees, at Frankfort and elsewhere, came, more or less directly, into contact with both schools of foreign reformers. What, and how much, does the reformed Church of England owe to Wittenberg and Geneva? Some acceleration, perhaps, but a vast amount of confusion and permanent injury. What benefit she received from them, she paid for at an immense price. Did the land of Wycliffe and the home of Ridley need an impulse from abroad to free it from papal tyranny? Let those who choose, believe in such an amazing necessity! We are moved to retort that the Church of England could have very well spared such unruly spirits, as were some of the imported divines as well as her own returned refugees, like Knox and Cartwright; that her diseases were hardly severe enough to need the terrible purgation of Cromwell's rebellion; that her constitution was little strengthened by having her vitals strained and torn by the fierce contentions of Presbyterians and Independents; and that these were precisely the debts she owed to the Saxons and Helvetians,—these, and nothing else. This is not intended to be of the nature of a *retort discourteous*. We need not throw these things up against the Continental Reformers as intentional injuries of which they were guilty;—nor need we be particularly grateful for such benefits. We respectfully submit that the National Church which possessed the universities of Cambridge and Oxford and the memories of Stephen Langton and Robert Grosseteste, was perfectly competent to take care of herself, that she had scholarship enough to translate the Bible and read Cyprian and Irenæus, Chrysostom and Augustine, the Cyrils, Gregories, Basils and Eusebii, Ambrose and Athanasius, and to deduce from such sources the True Faith of Genuine Catholicity, even if she had never heard so much as a single word concerning Luther's views of Justification, or Calvin's, of Predestination.

It was hardly within the range of possibility that a church, upon which had systematically been forced for centuries a congeries of false doctrines, should suddenly arise and shake herself entirely free from error, returning at once to the pristine purity from

which she had fallen. How could it have been expected that the English Church would succeed in accomplishing this after she had been so long subject to Rome and exposed to the corrupting influences of papal emissaries? Where there were rays of clear catholic teaching to guide her, she might indeed recover with speed and certainty the sacred deposit that had partly been wrested from her grasp; but, unfortunately, upon more than one important point with regard to which a decided stand had to be taken, the undivided body had not spoken unequivocally, because there had not been occasion to do so. In such cases it would be incomparably more difficult for her to ascertain the mind of the Spirit, because the abominations of her long servitude had defiled the mirror in which alone it could be seen reflected. She had lost the talisman by which truth could be distinguished from invention. The continued inculcation of error through generations had destroyed the sensitiveness of the common understanding, by which in better times, while the multitude had not yet suffered the contaminations of a worse than Egyptian bondage, it had instinctively turned towards eternal verity. The wonder ought not to be that the English Reformation did not escape without flaws appearing in the manufactured fabric, but that they were so few in number and not more vital in kind. Upon the removal of the disturbing mass, the needle flew back and pointed with marvelous closeness towards the true north.

In early times it was a very rare occurrence for any sect to do away with the old received method of church government. Whether they were mere schismatics like the Donatists of Africa, or heretics also like the followers of Arius, Eusebius, and Aëtius, the separatists always took pains to preserve an apostolic ministry. None but the wildest sects, entirely outside of the pale of Christianity, such as the Manichæans, ventured to construct new hierarchies. Therefore, the early church had never had cause to pronounce definitely upon the necessity of maintaining the time-honored order. It might be demonstrable that it had acted and taught in such a way as to imply a belief in the validity of episcopal ordination, and of that alone under any and all circumstances, but such belief had certainly never been authoritatively formulated. Consequently the *church* question came before Cranmer and his compeers pressing for an adjudication, but affording them little upon which to base one. And there was no question which

Roman assumption had done more to perplex. Had she not been teaching, ever since the days of Leo, if not from an earlier period than even that, that she was the centre of Christendom, its standard of orthodoxy, its principle of unity, its very heart and life? Generation after generation had grown up in implicit belief of this doctrine, even within the sea-lashed borders of freedom-loving Britain. And now the Island Church had flown off from this great centre of attraction. How shall it live disunited from the heart? Can it set up an independent circulation? Who does not see that the belief in visible ecclesiastical unity was shaken to its very roots, especially since it was testified by all authentic history that the Western Patriarchate had assumed prominence so far back that the mind of man hardly ran to the contrary? If the English Church had been torn loose from the Apostolic See, was it not in fully as bad a position as even the continental bodies, with their wholly new organizations? Moreover, the arrogant pontiffs had sought to degrade the priesthood in general by insisting that its whole authority emanated from God's vicegerent, to the extent that all bishops and presbyters were merely his delegates, by him commissioned and empowered to act in his name, thus confusing the boundaries of the different orders and powerfully tending to subvert the entire theory of a divinely authorized ministry. What was to become of episcopal authority after the incensed pope had withdrawn so much of it as he had conveyed? How natural it was for such as had been taught to trace the clerical commission to Rome as its source, to look for another fountain of delegated authority to him before whom they now did homage as the earthly head of the ecclesiastical corporation, and to accept the execrable notion that the Christian ministry is a higher species of state police! Thus much, at least, had Rome done to confound men's minds on this momentous topic, and she had a potent ally in that feeling of sympathy which is so much stronger than all the arguments of logic. The Reformed communities of the continent were engaged in the same desperate struggle into which Henry had launched the English Church. All had one common foe; all fought in one common cause. How, then, should the Church of England refuse to those Christian societies the name of *Sister Churches?* Would it not be extremely ungracious, little short of insulting, to withhold such a title from those with whom she was almost daily exchanging courtesies, and to whom she was

herself beholden for many a favor? What right had she to pronounce upon the status of independent bodies? If they, professing steadfast adherence to all the great truths of Christianity, were content without apostolic ordination, was she so much wiser than they that she could adjudicate upon the tenableness of their position? With the thunders of the Vatican still rumbling in her ears, should she rashly alienate her best friends?

Now that the cloud of battle has lifted from the scene of conflict, we may surely be permitted to survey the ground with our own eyes and draw our own conclusions. Let us remember that the church of the sixteenth century was not, like that of the fourth, an uncorrupted body contending against the inroads of heresy, but a diseased organization struggling to throw off the noxious humors. The Homoöusion controversy was settled amid the turmoil of a tremendous war, but the orthodox party occupied a vantage ground which the Reformers did not possess. A chaotic condition of affairs prevailed in matters of doctrine during the era of the Reformation. Instead of holding fast to a form of sound words and to a well-defined system of established faith, the divines of that epoch were obliged to unearth the truth, each man for himself, from beneath an immense mass of rubbish. As every age has its peculiar tendencies, so that age had its own doctrinal bias. Let us never forget that, if the judicious Hooker was betrayed into unfortunate admissions with regard to the status of the continental bodies, he also allowed himself to be bewildered by the fogs of predestination, and strenuously advocate such a figment as that of "Final Perseverance." It was no disgrace to that redoubtable champion that he could not at once fight his way clear of every obstruction; but shall we refuse to profit from the efforts of the strong and true men who have since arisen? The English Church seems finally to have shaken her skirts free from Calvinism, notwithstanding that Hooker, and Leighton, and Coleridge were tinctured strongly with the peculiar ideas of that system; and why may she not be permitted to treat another sixteenth-century error in the same way? Shall we forbid her to take so much as one step in advance? Let, then, the torch be applied to her libraries and her institutions of learning, for of what use are the ponderous erudition and acute reasoning of a Bull or a Waterland, if they may not be permitted to instruct us more perfectly in the facts and beliefs of primitive Christianity, and to show us

that even a Hooker could trip? How immense is the debt of gratitude due Almighty God for the protection He extended to the English Church while she was in the midst of so much confusion, guarding her from the great perils towards which her warmest sympathies were insensibly drawing her, and preserving to her the unbroken succession which she so grossly undervalued!

The same Reverence for Antiquity, which guided the progress of the English Reformers towards doctrinal correctness, marked their formation of a liturgy. In the Conference held at the Savoy in 1661, the Presbyterian divines presented for adoption, as a permissible substitute for the Prayer-book then in use, a liturgy drawn up by a single individual, Richard Baxter, who must himself have been not a little startled at the notion that such a hasty, ill-digested, and crude production could be put into the scales with a grand compilation which was the outgrowth of many centuries. Greater modesty presided in the councils of the Church. When in King Edward's reign the project was entertained of setting forth a service-book, there was no more thought of composing an entirely original one, than there was throughout the whole struggle an intention of devising a new platform of faith. The humble belief prevailed that such forms as had been cut out, rounded, and polished by previous generations were likely to be incomparably superior to any compositions gotten up for the occasion. These might answer the purpose well enough if none better could be found, and would doubtless improve with the lapse of time and the changes which experience would suggest; but where was the wisdom of throwing away all the fruits of ancestral labor, and beginning entirely anew? If, as was certainly the case, Romish errors had crept in, would it not be more prudent to weed them out than to dig the ground all over and plant fresh seed, which would be exposed to the inevitable vicissitudes of the seasons? So, gathering together the various liturgies which were employed in different sections and dioceses, chief among which ranked the "Use of Sarum," Cranmer and his committee set themselves the task of compiling from them a common *use* for the whole realm, religiously preserving the ancient forms as far as possible, carefully eradicating, however, all that savored of false doctrine or objectionable observance, and substituting the vulgar tongue for the obsolete phraseology in which the meaning had hidden itself from all but the learned few. Thus was framed the First Service-

Book of Edward VI., which was issued in 1549, and forms the basis of the Book of Common Prayer now authorized by the Church of England. Instead of being the production of a few learned and pious men of a single generation, it may be said to have borrowed the choicest flowers from ancient liturgies, such as the Mozarabic and Gallican, and from the sacramentaries of Leo, Gelasius, and Gregory, and to contain anthems and collects which had been in constant use in the worship of Almighty God for perhaps as many as fifteen centuries. This book was revised under Edward in 1552, and again in 1559 under Elizabeth, was assailed by Non-conformist divines at the Conference granted by James I. at Hampton Court in 1604, and was subjected to a final assault by the Presbyterians at the Savoy discussion; but passed through the ordeals without serious injury, although the clamor against it waxed hotter and hotter as Dissent grew stronger and more confident. The Prayer-book stood its ground, and soon enshrined itself in the love and veneration of all loyal children of the English Church as a most precious legacy of the Ages.

Besides these service-books, documents and treatises of various kinds were issued for the instruction and guidance of the clergy and people, and for the defense of the faith. Reluctant as the more prudent minds may have been to multiply forms of belief, and set authoritative limits to the rambling of opinion narrower than those which had been sufficient down to their day, a necessity was upon them from which they could not escape. It was the fashion of the times to fabricate catechisms and confessions. All parties were busy at the work. Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, and the Roman Catholics were shaping doctrines, fitting them together carefully, and framing them into strange edifices, which might be useful, but certainly were not attractive. Yet people in vast multitudes were seeking shelter within these skeleton houses, and, imagining themselves protected, were loudly praising the architects, and shouting to others to come and join them. The English Church must either reconcile herself to the prospect of losing large numbers of her children, or else follow the general example and erect her own particular frame-work of doctrine; and indeed she could not but acknowledge that the universal prevalence of a debased faith had rendered expedient the setting forth in clear and authoritative formulæ, accompanied with copious and accurate expositions, of those points in which it had suffered depravation.

Her singular merit was the never forgetting that she had no right to say what the faith ought to be, or to reason out what it must be, but that when once she had declared what it always had been, her function was at an end. Instead of turning her glance inward to see what kind of a creed would best comport with her own ideas and feelings, she modestly and reverentially opened her ear to the testimony of the ages, distrusting the conclusions of her own understanding till she found them to harmonize with the teachings of the past.

An archdeacon of Nottingham, as early as 1535, or only two years after the separation from Rome, drew up a simple tract intended for the unlearned public and called the King's Primer. The first series of Articles was published the next year by the joint authority of the King and both Houses of Convocation: they did not indicate the abandonment of much Romish error. A fuller exposition of the faith as then held was contained in the famous "Bishop's Book," or "The Institution of a Christian Man." Three years later the temporary triumph of Gardiner and the anti-reform party was signalized by the passage of a statute enforcing Six Articles of a decidedly Romish complexion with such sanguinary rigor that the Act became known as the "six-stringed whip:" burning at the stake was the penalty affixed for disputing against transubstantiation, and death without benefit of clergy for denying any one of the five other Articles. Next came the "Rationale," which contained an explanation of ritual and a justification of its retention; and a little later the "King's Book" or the "Necessary Doctrine and Erudition of a Christian Man," in the composition of some difficult portions of which the hand of Redmayne is conspicuous, who was the Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, and not, perhaps, excelled in ability and breadth of mind by any of his contemporaries. It was in many respects a most admirable production, but labored under the great defect of strenuously maintaining transubstantiation, concomitancy, and non-communicating attendance. In 1547, the year of Edward's accession, appeared the first book of Homilies, intended to be read from the pulpit in the place of sermons; the second book, although promised in the first, not being published till the reign of Elizabeth. Besides the various series of Articles already mentioned, a set of *Thirteen* had been drawn up, on occasion of the negotiations opened, under Henry, with the Lutheran divines, to serve as a

compromise or basis of union, but had never received any official sanction. These, however, were resuscitated as a guide for Cranmer and the learned divines who assisted him in preparing and revising the Forty-two Articles, which were just beginning to be put in circulation when the tide of Romanism rushed in through the gates that Mary's hand threw open. As soon as Elizabeth had restored the ascendancy to Protestantism, Archbishop Parker undertook a reärranging of the Articles of belief, being materially aided in this work by the ready coöperation of Jewel, the noted apologist. Those which he ultimately presented to Convocation differed only slightly from Cranmer's Forty-two, and were formally ratified, after a few modifications and erasures had been made, in 1562. With some changes, they were afterwards sanctioned by the Queen and duly promulgated. Then, in 1571, they were again revised, signed anew by both Houses of Convocation, and sent forth into the world, Thirty-nine in number, and bearing the same form and appearance which they have ever since worn. This list may be closed with a brief notice of the Lambeth Articles, for which Archbishop Whitgift is responsible: they were thoroughly Calvinistic and Supralapsarian, were received by Burleigh with strong disapprobation and by Elizabeth almost with disgust, and merely had the result of affixing a stigma to the name of their author.

We have seen that the English Church, after asserting its independence, retained both the faith and worship which it had had before, changing them gradually as it discerned cause under the white light of the pure and genuine catholicity to which it appealed. We are now to inquire whether its organic existence was not impaired to such an extent that it ceased to be a living branch of the One Church. To determine that it preserved an apostolic ministry is not sufficient, because it might nevertheless, by cutting itself off from the body of the faithful, have forfeited its claim to the gift of the Holy Ghost. The whole investigation reduces itself down to this question, Was a sentence of excommunication, pronounced by a bishop who had so exalted his just patriarchal dignity that he claimed autocratic power over the churches, and acquiesced in by the numerous provincial churches which acknowledged his sway, against an autocephalous body on account of its refusal to submit any longer to his exorbitant, unfounded, and ungodly usurpations, sufficient to deprive that body of its character

and being as a portion of that Church which Christ promised to be with unto the end of the world? We answer distinctly, No; for an unjust excommunication, as that most plainly was, is utterly invalid, except as injuring the one who fulminates it. This being admitted, we are thrown back upon the question, Did the reformed Church really possess a duly-ordained episcopal ministry? If the English bishops and clergy were endued with the grace of Holy Orders before 1533, they must also have been so posterior to that important date of separation, because every bishop,—with the exception of Fisher of Rochester,—consented to take the oath of royal supremacy. Mary having filled the sees with adherents of the papacy, it would have been entirely proper for Elizabeth, in her turn, to have expelled them and instated friends of the new movement; but she was pleased to act towards the incumbents with great leniency, supplanting none but the most unyielding, whom she could not spare without violating the great law of self-protection. A ridiculous story concerning the consecration of Matthew Parker has been manufactured out of whole cloth by Jesuitical unscrupulousness; but it can be passed over with the brief remark that it is an unmitigated falsehood, deserving the appellation of the Nag's-Head *Fable*; and that the worthy and distinguished Archbishop was regularly consecrated at Lambeth, on the 17th of December, 1559, by Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgkins, four bishops in good standing. The Church of Rome, we moreover allege, having withheld its bull of excommunication till 1570, and so allowed all its followers within the borders of England to worship, for the first twelve years of the Virgin Queen, at the altars served by Parker's clergy, is in a very poor position to deny the validity of Anglican Orders. If Pius V. and his predecessor did not by this delay tacitly acknowledge the English reformed Church as a living, if not as an independent, church, we are somewhat at a loss to imagine how they could have done so more effectually.

The English Reformation, with all those fortunate characteristics which distinguished it from the Saxon and the Swiss, was not an accident, but the result, in a greater measure, of those causes which had made the English nation what it was, nourishing within it those two noble sentiments which, when properly combined, raise the national, or the individual, character to the very highest grade,—intense reverence for all that is venerable, and inextin-

guishable love of liberty. Working in the sphere of civil life, these two principles resulted in a steady march towards the permanent establishment of free institutions, not so much by means of a series of revolutions, as through a temperate, but inflexible, resistance of aggression; and evolved the Common Law, which is a system of precedents built upon the maxim that the old is not, without the very best of reasons, to be changed. In the sphere of religion, these same sentiments, the one restraining and the other impelling, held the Church tightly bound to the faith which had descended from its forefathers bearing the stamp of catholicity, and yet spurred it on to an examination of each and every article of the current belief which seemed at all doubtful, and to the final and absolute rejection of all which could not abide the test of the Vincentian Canon. Reverence and independence were traits of the national character, because the germs, which are present in a more or less healthy condition in all races, had been peculiarly vigorous in the composite race which had grown out of the commingling of the original inhabitants with the successive invaders; and because they had developed under such favorable auspices as were to be found in an insular situation, in the inheritance of various admirable codes of laws, and, above all, in the possession of a Church which is vitalizing air for them both.

It is often easier to destroy and reconstruct than to modify and reärrange. Of all easy things, the easiest is to destroy. A feeble blow from an idiot's hammer can, in a single moment, hopelessly deface the master-piece of a Domenichino or a Michael Angelo, an infant's hand can apply the torch to an Alexandrian library, or a random bullet can paralyze the mightiest brain and biggest heart. The work of reconstruction is, of course, harder, and yet it may be far from difficult, provided the builder is not very careful as to what he builds. To burn a ship is not hard, nor is it a very laborious task to construct a raft from the floating timbers of the wreck; but to haul the vessel up on the ways, and substitute sound planks for such as have rotted away, requires the skill of an artisan. To overturn the settled order of government and institute a new one is often within the power of any shallow fanatic; while to introduce needed reforms without resorting to the dangerous expedient of a revolution is an undertaking for the ablest statesman. The task before the English Reformers was not the simple one of undermining one theory and devising a new one, nor of

throwing down one edifice and erecting another according to their own plans and devices, for such processes are *fatal* to the Church of God; but it was one of enormous difficulty,—not less than that of analyzing a vast mass of mingled truth and error with a view to liberating the pure faith, and of restoring the outward organization to its former condition without destroying or impairing its corporate existence. Could such a work have been accomplished in an hour, or a day, or a month, or a year? Could it have been achieved by the fiat of a tyrant, the consultations of a convocation, or the assiduous labors of a pious sage? Such a movement could only have been brought to a happy termination by the gradual process of natural growth. As the man who has long suffered from severe disease cannot, by any means known to surgery or medicine, be at once completely cured, but must wait for the waste of his system to be slowly repaired by recuperative energy, so a sick church cannot be healed in a moment. All attempts to bring about such a result must produce disaster, and will be scouted by all sensible persons.

How strong must have been the feeling of conservatism in the national breast of England to triumph over the tremendous assaults which, now and again, threatened to drag or drive the church to one extreme or the other! How indomitable the resolve with which public sentiment clung to the freeman's prerogative of thinking and acting for himself! Henry's fierce despotism exerts itself in vain to tame the great throbbing heart of the nation and teach it to wear his chains. Scarcely has the liberated Church begun to taste the sweets of comparative freedom under the youthful Edward when death blights the fair promise of his reign. Then the caged panther broke loose and buried his keen fangs in the quivering flesh of his victim. With one blow of his paw he laid three mitred skulls in the ashes of Smithfield, sending dismay through the timid bosoms of an unshepherded flock. The red banner floated over England and filled the atmosphere with the luridness which it shook from its folds. The heedless bigotry of Philip and the unmeasured presumption of Rome were so tempered by the wise moderation, Christian charity, and statesmanlike skill of Cardinal Pole that they crushed instead of goading. Yet the Church of England did not succumb. It speedily revived under the benignant sway of Elizabeth, who in the earlier part of her reign managed ecclesiastical affairs with singular discretion.

With the accession of James I. the reäctionary movement began to gather head which he was too feeble and timid to control, and which, taking advantage of the gross maladministration of his successor, deprived Strafford and Laud of their honors and lives, and finally sent Charles himself to the scaffold. Then disorder reigned supreme, working its wild will with priest, and prayer-book, and temple, and playing havoc with all that was sanctified by age, established usage, or divine appointment. What Puritanism could do to take the life of the National Church was done. If the Church had no need to complain, though her civil rights were taken from her and her revenues confiscated, had she no cause to feel aggrieved that her bishops were driven from their sees and her priests compelled to sit in idleness, their families starving around them, while their flocks were given over into the charge of those whose pastoral staves had never been put into their hands by divine authority, and who were sure to lead astray such as would follow them? What men like Pearson, Bull, and Ussher suffered from Puritan persecution is matter of indelible record. Eight thousand of the clergy are said to have been deprived, and that without cause or provocation. Episcopacy was put under the ban, the Book of Common Prayer suppressed, churches turned into conventicles, altars desecrated. An *Episcopalian* might not, it is true, be seized the instant his faith was known, and hurried off to the dungeon, the rack, and the stake; but he could neither bury his dead, baptize his children, marry his wife, nor procure the life-giving food of the Eucharist without encountering obstacles that would discourage any but the most persevering, exposing himself to the derision of his neighbors, and perhaps involving himself in contempt of some arbitrary statute. Was the life or the spirit of the persecuted church crushed out of her? The shield of her Lord's protection was over her, the strength of His favor within her. What the open assaults of Romanism and Puritanism failed to accomplish, the lukewarmness and insidious hostility of the House of Hanover undertook with no better success. Founded upon the Rock, England's sorely-tried Church endured the storms, and fell not. She was neither lashed into fury, nor frightened into weak compliance; but through the dread ordeal, with pace quickened as the danger and the suffering increased, with eye fixed upon the cross which went before her as the pillar of cloud and of fire

before Israel of old, she marched steadily forward towards genuine Catholicity.

Would that in the mental constitution of Archbishop Cranmer there had entered somewhat more of courage and firmness! Then might a noble name have been spared a blot which now rests upon it. But in that event perhaps the influence of Cranmer would have predominated too much, and fashioned Englishmen into Cranmerites instead of Churchmen. If that great and good man did yield to the threats of his enemies, there were those whose souls were made of better stuff, and he himself afterwards redeemed his fair fame by summoning resolution to die like a Christian hero. Who shall compute the number of those who have drawn inspiration from the glorious examples of Nicholas Ridley, and of staunch Hugh Latimer, most outspoken of prelates? The English Church has little cause to be ashamed of such sons, or of the noble army of those who endured the life-long martyrdom of abuse and persecution at the hands of the Puritans. But let the memory of all such violence and ill-usage die out and be buried, except so far as it may be needed in order that we should duly value the martyrs of the Reformation. Blessed above all things to that communion were those times of trial. The prosperity of the Church, her alliance with the State, and the seeming support and strength and favor she thence derives, have raised up against her the bitterest enemies that have ever beset her pathway; for even the Independents did not hate *episcopacy* so much as they did *prelacy*, not the *bishop* as much as the *peer*. Adversity, on the other hand, has been to her the chastisement of a loving and wise Father, driving away from her the false and the faint-hearted, training the steadfast in the duties of the true soldier, and forcing into prominence such as were endowed by their Creator with the qualities of leadership. Many giant intellects have been given her, filled to overflowing with the lore of ages and skilled in the use of all the weapons of logic, large hearts bubbling over with sympathy for all the hopes and fears of mankind, throbbing with pity for its woes, and thirsting for opportunities to advance its welfare both in time and in eternity, and resolute, inflexible, heroic wills, able to do, and dare, and suffer anything at the call of duty or the promptings of love; and much have these done to shed the brilliant light of Heaven upon the Church Militant within the boundaries of England;

but, for the rescue of that Church from the perils which crowded so thickly about her during the Reformation era, the praise must be ascribed to Him whose arm alone was strong enough to *preserve* what He alone could have *created*, the *Kingdom of God* on earth.

CHAPTER XX.

THE AMERICAN CHURCH.

Flying from the evils, real or imaginary, which attend his present lot or threaten his future, temporarily oblivious of the strong and lasting attachment which almost every mortal feels for the spot which gave him birth, impelled and sustained by the universal longing of humanity for change, and filled with high hopes regarding the happiness to be found in strange climes and under altered circumstances, persons can always be enlisted in any adventure which holds out the glittering prizes of wealth and ease, to be won at the price of brief, if arduous, effort. When the genius and perseverance of the heroic Genoese had permanently added to the map of the world that distant continent, which poetry had depicted under the glowing imagery of the fabled Atlantis, and the roving barks of adventurous Northmen had sighted when running helpless before the prolonged tempest and anxiously looking for shelter, a vast territory invited the inhabitants of the densely-peopled states of Europe to breathe its free air and snatch the golden fruit held out by the prodigality of centuries as a reward for hardihood, independence, and daring. Many nations vied with each other in colonizing the new continent. The foremost races of Europe sent of their boldest spirits as pioneers into the pathless wilderness, and when these fell victims to disease, or famine, or the tomahawk, dispatched ten ardent recruits to fill the place of each. The choicest fountains mingled their waters in one stream, which sparkled with their combined virtues. If commixture of blood tends towards the production of a superior race, what a compounding was here! One tributary brought from Palos and Barcelona the concentrated worth of the original Spaniard, the Roman, the Goth, and the Moor; another flowed laden with the noble qualities of the Gaul, the Frank, the ubiquitous Latin, and the Dane; a third bore along the fused nation-

alities which had successively hurled themselves upon the English shores; while Scandinavians, and Dutch, and Scotch, and Irish, and Germans, and the natives of Italy's fertile soil made up other rills to swell the mighty tide and render it still more composite. The settlers came to a glorious land. They built their huts beneath the waving boughs of the primeval forest upon ground enriched by the accumulated vegetal deposit of countless ages. At their feet broke the waves which had been gathering impetus ever since they sped from the unseen shore thousands of miles away. Behind them stretched the unbroken forest, for hundreds of miles, across mighty ranges that lifted their long backs skywards, ending then in boundless prairies which sadly renewed the infinitude of the sea. No shallow rivulets poured the furious torrents of winter with hoarse roar through the affrighted land, and then shrank abashed and exhausted into petty brooks, or left dry beds to mock the thirsty traveler; but broad, deep, perennial rivers, rushing in silent strength and generous fullness through the laughing land, intersected the whole breadth of North America, at once affording drainage and supplying moisture to the air, adding beauty to the landscape and offering priceless facilities to trade, commerce, and manufacture. One envies the Dutch navigator whose eye first traced the rugged rock-face of the Palisades, saw the soft light of evening rest upon the undulating eastern bank of Tappan Zee, dimly discerned the sharp peaks behind an elevated plateau which sweeps from the bold mountains about Rockland Lake to the historic vicinity of Stony Point, beheld the first ray of morning smite upon Dunderberg's stern forehead, marked baffling winds ruffle the calm surface while opposing ranges conspired to retain his clumsy vessel in the charmed reach, lingered upon the grandeur of the Southern Gateway looming so solemnly far behind, looked through the Northern Entrance of the Highlands, with dome-shaped Storm King towering rock-fronted and awful-browed far above him, out upon the broad expanse of river and woodland to the shadowy Katskills, and delighted itself with the lovely bays and beautiful, rocky, evergreen-crowned promontories, which passed before it as the voyage extended northwards, feasting continuously upon an incomparable and ever-varying scene. Did he conjecture what an importance would presently attach to that lonely, but matchless, river as a main artery of a great metropolis? Did he perceive how well calculated it was by

nature to form the outlet of a vast agricultural district, laying its tribute at the wharves of a haughty city? Was his power of penetration sufficient to show him in a vision how the multitudes of that city, rich and poor, when enervated and worn out by the luxuriousness and laborious excitement of such centres of wealth, would dart away from the unrest, the turmoil, the infected air, the depressing influences of the great emporium which should one day grow into such magnitude and dignity at its mouth, and take refuge amid the glories of this queenliest of rivers, slaking the thirst of their souls at the crystal pool provided by Nature's bountiful hand? A glorious river and a glorious continent! made, however, be it remembered, by God, and not by the proud nation who boast the possession of them.

The voyage from Europe to America was long: it was perilous. Multitudes made it, nevertheless. The privations and dangers to be encountered when the settlement had been formed, were far from inconsiderable; but were insufficient to deter those left behind from imitating the example of such as had gone before them. Anglo-Saxon blood and traditions predominated, and the sway of Great Britain was acknowledged from Hudson's Bay to the Gulf of Mexico. The English government presumes upon its authority, drives thirteen colonies into a revolt, and is compelled to concede their independence after a struggle which tests and develops the manhood of the Americans through eight years of severe trial. In 1812 another war breaks out by reason of an insolent claim which England advances to the right of searching our vessels for British sailors. At New Orleans, Plattsburg, and Lundy's Lane the countrymen of Wellington are overmatched. The choicest troops recoil from the push of American bayonets. On Lakes Champlain and Erie, and over the broad seas, McDonough, Perry, Bainbridge, Decatur, and other commanders tame the pride of the English navy. At the close of the first war a most admirable constitution is adopted under the influence of such men as Jefferson, Hamilton, the Adamses, and, above all, of that grandest of patriotic generals and statesmen, the illustrious Washington. The resources of the country are developed with marvelous rapidity. Civilization strides westward as fast as the avenues of commerce can be opened, and even outruns the panting, screeching locomotive. That higher interests than those of material progress are not wholly neglected is proved by the

springing up on all sides of school-houses and edifices for public worship, by the charts of the Coast Survey, by the establishment of stations for meteorological observation, and by the numerous and highly important contributions made by American sages, philosophers, and devotees of the fine arts, to learning, science, literature, and art.

Nevertheless, being yet in her youth, America should look to the future for the achievement of worthy undertakings and for the acquisition of substantial fame. It is rather what she is yet to become than what she already is, that must mark out for her her proper place among the nations. She will wofully delude herself if she hearkens to the boastful strains of the orator who finds it to his interest that he should sing her praises. As she lives for the future, let her shun the dangers which threaten her. One great peril hangs portentous in her sky. Whence it comes we hardly may venture to ask. Is there lacking in the inherited traits of the American race a due proportion of Dutch phlegm and German patience and thrift? or have the circumstances of its history and the nature of its institutions strengthened other characteristics at the expense of these? or is there some peculiarity in the climate which diminishes robustness and vitality, and generates a certain feverish restlessness? Whatever may be its source, the deficiency is prominent enough; and, unless some antidote or compensation be found for it, will produce disastrous results, probably poisoning the American character and rendering it utterly feeble, capricious, and unreliable. The great defect may be specified as a want of conservatism, a strong predilection for the new and disregard, or even contempt, for the old, a lack of reverence manifesting itself most painfully in the customary disobedience exhibited by the young, in the frequent use of profane and foul language, and in a boastful exaltation of the present era, accompanied by an unmeasured extolling of everything American. Such a weakness of national character is a very serious one, leading almost inevitably to inordinate vanity, the practice of throwing upon the market fabrics worthless by reason of undue haste in their manufacture, a negligent and unremunerative method of tillage, the multiplying of unsafe and unsubstantial dwellings and public buildings, superficialness in scholarship, and all the other results which naturally flow from over-estimation of one's own abilities, and over-eagerness to succeed. Whence can the much-needed conservatism be so easily

and effectively infused into the American character as from the great source of respect, reverence, sobriety, patience, and humility,—that grand Institution which is ever looking back with profound self-abasement to the testimony of the ages and the revealed truth of God, which teaches men to distrust themselves and their own deductions, and bids them recognize in venerableness and stability criteria of truth and worth? It may be distasteful to the Nineteenth Century to hear that it has anything to learn from the First, it may not be gratifying to national pride to be told that customs, laws, methods which have barely withstood the assaults of one hundred years, are less trustworthy than such as have endured the convulsions of nearly two thousand; but unwelcome lessons are sometimes not unwholesome. What principle of permanency can possibly exist in sects which are perhaps younger than youthful America, which ridicule all appeal to antiquity, which teach every man to do what seems good in his own eyes, which perpetually shift their anchorage, so as to deny at one time what they strenuously affirm at another, which are the creatures of yesterday and will die to-morrow. Let men mock at the purblind souls which are content to grope with the moles and bats in the subterranean darkness of hoar antiquity, let them smile at antiquated notions, obsolete customs, and mediæval superstitions, while the sanctity of marriage, the holiness of home, honesty in business transactions, incorruptibility in public station, temperance, soberness, and chastity are being swallowed up in a general whirl of extravagance, luxuriousness, and debauchery; let them throw over these fearful facts the cloak of periodical excitement, or strive to forget them amid persistent reïterations of mutual assurances that they do not exist; let them comfort themselves with doctrines invented for the express purpose of proving that crime is mental disease and not moral delinquency, and with the consoling delusions of a soft, self-indulgent, easy-going Christianity, which knows nothing of the Cross save as a jeweled ornament; let them drive into hostility to religion those who have manliness enough to despise beliefs which cannot abide the test of reasoning nor satisfy the longings of a heroic heart to sacrifice itself for its Lord;—and the divine judgment will, sooner or later, descend upon the land in overpowering wrath, short, sharp, and terrible.

Already has sectional jealousy given rise to one tremendous

contest. How many years of peace and prosperity will dawn upon the United States before the conflicting interests of different groups of states will again point brother's sword at the breast of brother? Mutterings of a coming storm are occasionally heard. The financial question is a fruitful source of controversy between East and West, and it is becoming yearly more important with the growth of the country. The population is multiplying, the vacant lands are rapidly being taken possession of and put under cultivation. New states are being formed, and old ones are increasing in power and resources. A day is approaching which will see the arable territory of our country occupied, and the vast empire teeming with restless millions, greedy for money, careless of risk, indifferent to consequences, intelligent, enterprising, self-confident. What power will then be strong enough to bind together in one solar system these rushing worlds? Can sectarianism do it?—sectarianism that is the very principle of disunion, which is itself dividing and subdividing endlessly, as if to demonstrate the infinite divisibility of matter? Or shall we not look more hopefully towards the Catholic Church, which has always shown itself the friend and ally of law and order, which, although bound to that body of death, the Roman Empire, nevertheless preserved its own unity long after the final disruption of that once huge and powerful realm? Is there not some dependence to be placed upon a corporate society which professes to have organic union with the incarnate Son of God, guarded by rules and regulations of His appointment which have preserved it, without serious impairment, through all the revolutions and catastrophes of eighteen hundred years? Will not an organization which, spreading its ramifications over the breadth and length of the land and extending them into every corner, instructs all its members that willful separation from the body corporate is not only detrimental, as destructive of the outward and visible unity which ought to characterize a Christian brotherhood, but is the deadly sin of schism, entailing loss of all title to heavenly felicity, exert at least a slight influence in compacting the numerous states, north and south, east and west, great and small, into one mighty confederacy, as durable as it will be imposing?

But would it not be unkind, ungrateful, to give up that faith to which America owes so much of her freedom and independence for a creed which is identified with absolute power? Does our

country, then, owe so much to Puritanism? We very much doubt it. In its early days, Puritanism showed itself to the full as intolerant, arbitrary, illiberal, and narrow as those from whose tyranny it professed to have suffered. Poetry may perhaps be excused for sweetly singing, concerning the first landing of the "Pilgrim Fathers" upon the "stern and rock-bound coast" of New England, that they "left unstained what there they found, freedom to worship God;" but sober history must be suffered to relate how bitterly they persecuted Anabaptists, Quakers, and all others whose consciences and judgments did not exactly coïncide with their own. The Roman Catholics of Maryland established complete toleration for all who believed in the Lord Jesus Christ; the Puritans of Massachusetts and Connecticut cut off ears, burned tongues, and otherwise maltreated Presbyterians, Baptists, Churchmen, and other "heretics," scourging, banishing, and killing them. In the mother-country, sectarianism ran riot under Cromwell; but it was the sturdy, quiet, and inflexible spirit of sound churchmanship which had gradually forced from the crown acknowledgments of the Commons' rights and confirmations of their privileges, and which, eventually triumphing over the hostile spirit of misrule, firmly established the admirable system of limited and constitutional monarchy under which Englishmen now enjoy as much freedom, perhaps, as men can have without rushing into license. Let it, however, be said that American Puritanism soon lost the objectionable features which made it so unlovely in its earlier days, and rapidly succumbed to the influence of the new continent, forgetting in a generation or two much of its narrowness and many of its prejudices, and suffering its adherents to broaden out into the distinguished patriots whom it gave to the councils and battle-fields of the Revolution. Let us grant Puritanism its proper meed of praise, and no more.

To run a career of glorious achievement, the American Church is in a condition in which no church has been since the days of Constantine till she was born amid the throes of the Revolution. It is true that, from the accession of William and Mary, Scotland had had a church of her own, free from any debasing connection with the civil government; but the Scottish Church was so unfortunately circumstanced that the prospects of her ever prospering greatly seemed faint enough. The Church in America has had to contend against no great overshadowing establishment like the

Presbyterian Kirk in Scotland, but has, in a measure at least, had a fair field on which to do battle for her life. She suffered not a little during the Revolutionary period by reason of the suspicion which attached to her as the daughter of the church established in the kingdom with which the colonists were at war, and was often charged with toryism, as she has been since with aversion to free institutions and to a republican form of government; but she has escaped the deadliness of the enmity which has so often assailed the Mother-Church upon grounds purely political. Few, comparatively, have dissented from her because they supposed her doctrines inherently opposed to their political sentiments; and none, because they charged her with having joined hands with the government to oppress them. The American Church is free, and may well thank God for having delivered her from her Mother's thralldom. She may at times think it hard that she is left to fight her own battles with nothing but supernatural aid to support her; yet she must herself feel that such thoughts belong only to the hour of weakness, and are unworthy of her high calling. It is a glorious thing to be free! To know that none lower than God Himself is her master, or has the right to enact laws for her to obey, except, indeed, the great Catholic Church of which she herself is an integral portion; to have the exalted responsibility of waging warfare for her Eternal King with the forces of evil that are banded against her, and to be in a position to do this without fear or favor; are things worth living for. Not to herself does she owe her freedom, any more than she does her original being. It may not be to the Church's credit that, having once been enslaved, she never rose to an appreciation of her birthright and demanded to be free again, and that the nearest approach she ever made, during the long lapse of centuries, to an assertion of her prerogatives, was that of imitating the State, and trying, in her turn, to make a serf of it; but the facts are precisely such. She is not free in the United States on account of any wise movements, or prudent precautions, or far-sighted policy of her own, but merely because divine Providence was pleased that it should be so. Thus God Himself has wrought another most important reformation in the Church which He died to redeem. Are we not justified in confidently believing that His favor has not yet deserted her, and that He intends her to fulfill a grand destiny! Why else has her polity been preserved intact through so many revolutions, and why has she been restored to

the condition in which she won such splendid triumphs during the period before Constantine the Great? God, we see, has not forgotten His promises, and will not cease to be gracious unto her.

But, before the embracing serpent unwound itself from the body of its intended victim, it tightened its coils with the expiring rage of desperation till the blood stagnated in the compressed veins and the very bones cracked beneath the strain. For a century and a half the English Establishment held the infant Church of America in her remorseless grasp. Where would the Church of England have been, had Britain herself been treated as she treated the Colonies? The successful missionary leader was almost immediately consecrated to the episcopate, and so endowed with all necessary power and authority to plant an apostolic church that should lack no element of growth and stability; but the successor of Augustine dared not, and in one sense could not, ordain a single bishop for the vast territory of North America, separated by three thousand miles of ocean from the parent country, and evidently destined soon to swarm with countless myriads of intelligent, industrious, and thriving inhabitants. Reasons of state interfered with the free action of God's ministers, and forbade their sending a chief-shepherd to watch, as he only could, over the welfare and safety of Christ's flock. Technical difficulties, due entirely to the existence of an ungodly relationship which virtually constituted an enslavement of the church, prevented the English bench from listening to the earnest supplications of the detached and languishing congregations of American "Episcopalians" that they might have a bishop to oversee their affairs. Lord Clarendon, in his zeal for the pure faith, might strongly favor the project of consecrating a missionary bishop, and prelates like Berkeley, Gibson, Butler, and Sherlock might strenuously advocate the measure, but all to no purpose while there existed a ministry composed, as for example the celebrated *Cabal* cabinet was, of Infidels, Papists, and a Presbyterian. The State itself reaped as it deserved to reap. The hearts of thousands of settlers, who were naturally drawn by religion, as well as by birth and inherited affection, to the father-land, who under a different treatment would have remained staunch loyalists, were alienated by this course of reckless indifference, and driven into fraternizing with those whose education and traditions rendered them violently

hostile to crosier and sceptre alike. As for the Church, she seems to breathe with a difficulty suggestive of speedy dissolution. The apostolic rite of Confirmation, whereby the Holy Ghost is bestowed upon those whom the regeneration of baptism has fitted for the reception of such a gift, not administered for one hundred and fifty years; the grace of Holy Orders withheld for that length of time from all who were not in a position to undertake a long and expensive voyage; no supervision, except that of an occasional commissary sent out to act for the bishop of London, exercised during that full period over the scattered congregations, which were often destitute, too, for many years of pastoral care and control;—what condition was this for a religious corporation to live, and thrive, and grow in, which requires by its essential constitution some sort at least of episcopal government? It seemed as though the experiment were being made how much the Church could bear without extinction; as though a heartless state-policy were putting her to tests not less painful and crucial than those which science applies, in vivisection, to the quivering frames of dumb brutes. That she did not succumb to the torture and die, is little short of a miracle; but her Lord did not intend that the New World, the chosen battle-ground of innumerable sects, should be left without some organization capable of bearing witness to the true Catholic faith and gathering souls into the one safe fold.

When William of Orange drove the Stuarts from their throne, eight English Bishops, with Sancroft of Canterbury at their head, together with their brethren of the Scottish bench, conceiving themselves bound in conscience by the oaths which they had taken to support the deposed family, refused to transfer their allegiance to the new monarch, and consequently incurred the royal displeasure. From that date onwards the Church in Scotland, under the superintendence of the non-juring bishops, existed independent of the secular government and bravely contending against immense odds. Unfettered by state ties, the Scotch Episcopate, to which an appeal had previously been made in America's behalf by the liberal-minded Berkeley, was able to listen to Dr. Seabury's petition, when, having met with little encouragement in his efforts to secure consecration at the hands of the English prelates, he turned towards it with better hope. In the year 1784, on the 14th day of November, by the official act of three bishops

whose names should be known to every American Churchman,—Kilgour, Skinner, and Petrie, Bishop, and Coädjutor, of Aberdeen, and Bishop of Ross and Moray, respectively, the first named being also Primus of Scotland,—Samuel Seabury became invested with full apostolic authority and entitled to exercise it within the diocese of Connecticut. The majority of American Churchmen were unfortunately disposed to look coldly upon one whose orders had been conferred by Non-jurors. In 1787, after much delay caused by the legal difficulties which stood in the way of consecrating men who, being citizens of a free Republic, could not take the oath of allegiance to the British government, and also by a not-inexcusable fear that the youthful church would commit some great indiscretion and thereby forfeit its catholic character, or at least involve the Mother-Church in her perils, misfortunes, and just reproaches, Drs. White and Provoost received the full apostolic commission from the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the Bishops of Bath and Wells, and Peterborough, at the Archiepiscopal Chapel of Lambeth, on the 4th of February. Pennsylvania and New York being thus provided with bishops, there yet lacked one to make up the number necessary to a regular consecration, unless Bishop Seabury should be called in to assist. At length this knot was cut by the consecration of Dr. Madison for the diocese of Virginia, in 1790, which was the one hundred and eighty-third year since Robert Hunt had first unfurled the banner of the English Church on the northern bank of the James River. In 1792 the four bishops laid their united hands upon the head of Dr. Claggett, bishop-elect of Maryland, whose is the distinction of having been the first to be consecrated on American soil.

Thus the struggling and newly-emancipated church obtained a valid Episcopate. As she adopted the faith of the Mother-Church with only a very few and unimportant changes, and, in 1789, a Book of Common Prayer which was substantially identical with that which she had used before the Colonies had achieved their independence (the only really important alterations being the omission of the Athanasian Creed and of the Commination Service and the incorporation into the Communion Office of certain features suggested by the Scotch Liturgy), it cannot be denied that, if the Church of England is a living and comparatively pure branch of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, the American

offshoot is so likewise. Certainly, intercommunion between mother and daughter has not been broken off during the century that has elapsed since the Declaration of Independence gave warning that a distinct organization for the latter might soon become indispensable.

A society or a corporation cannot exist long in an abnormal condition without experiencing injurious effects. Shall we suppose, then, that the Church of God, being constituted, as we are convinced that by divine charter it is, with bishops as its only proper chief rulers, could continue for such a length of time on an enforced congregational basis without suffering great loss of vital tone? Congregational societies, it is true, flourished well enough on a foundation, ostensible and real, of that description, but they do not teach the doctrine that we hold forth before the people, instructing them in the necessity of sacramental grace, ministerial authority, and the witness of a continuous organization. A church without a bishop is a body without a head; and a church with its episcopal ruler removed from it by the width of the Atlantic, is a body corporate doomed to a very feeble condition. The great wonder is that, infected by the religious atmosphere around them, and stung by the unnatural conduct of a mother who could not act as she would towards her offspring, which, doubtless, she loved far more tenderly than she dared to show, the whole mass of Church-people did not rise in revolt and join the ranks of Dissent; and that they did not do so, but compelled themselves to bear patiently as much neglect and ill-usage as could well be put upon them, is a very strong testimony to the correctness of the principles to which they clung so tenaciously. Nevertheless, large numbers were estranged, in whole or in part, from the communion of their forefathers, while others sat weeping over the ruin that seemed coming upon their Zion. It is lamentable enough to reflect that whole congregations were thus irretrievably lost to the True Church, whose livery they stripped off from themselves, and whose colors they traitorously and cravenly trampled in the dust; but it is far sadder to contemplate the frightful degeneracy which pervaded the whole American communion, in consequence of the false position into which she had been forced. What must be the result upon the minds of thinking people of inculcating upon them, in every way, the great necessity of baptism, and then leaving them to move heaven and earth with supplication, and crying, and bitter

mourning for a priest to administer that sacrament; of holding up the advantages of the apostolic rite of confirmation, and keeping thousands of people without the possibility of obtaining those benefits which you have persuaded them are so great; of remaining aloof from large societies of Christians because they have no valid ministry, and then refusing to supply your own starving people with those who alone, you tell them, can bring down for them the bread from Heaven? Such glaring, ay! monstrous, contradictions between theory and practice did strike with stunning force upon all minds, impelling them towards courses of action, which were more or less fatal, according to their various bents and the nature of the training they had received. How could any but the most robust souls retain a warm attachment to their church, or a firm belief in its claims? How was it possible that the rulers of God's kingdom on earth could be fully convinced that it was in any exclusive sense His peculiar dominion, and yet take so little pains to extend its boundaries, or even to preserve territory already conquered? Would not the Virginia or Connecticut Churchman be constantly asking himself, Do these English prelates, who turn so deaf an ear to our pleadings, really believe that an apostolic ministry and a continuity of organization are of any vital importance, that the vaunted privileges of the true Church are any privileges at all, or that there is any difference worth troubling one's self about between Churchmanship and Dissent?

The result was that the tone of the Church sank to the level of sectarianism, and lower yet if that be possible. Nothing, after the establishment of American independence, preserved the remnant of the faithful from drifting into the sects, and becoming absorbed in their ranks, but the lingering traditions of the fading past. Sentiment, rather than principle, seems to have actuated an overwhelming majority of those who retained their faith. Even the leaders clung to the ark of God, not because it was the Ark of the Covenant, in which alone safety could be found, but because they admired its shape and proportions, understood its management, and felt at home beneath its roof. They gathered around its standard, not because they felt that they were drawing their swords in defense of the Bride of the Lamb, but because they claimed the right, as free Americans, to worship in any way they saw fit. Whoever studies carefully the Memoirs of Bishop White can

hardly avoid the conclusion that even that meek-spirited, devout, and influential prelate had no superabundant knowledge of what genuine catholicity is, and still smaller sympathy with it. Indeed, no more humiliating exercise can be undertaken by a true son of the American Church than that of reading the records of the early Conventions, with the comments made upon them by him who, in many respects, was their foremost member. With the exception of Bishop Seabury, who, like Ridley, was independent and original enough to think for himself, and a few others, hardly a man seems to have had the slightest idea that it was a matter of any great consequence, except to the handful who happened to possess a strong preference for her, whether the Catholic Church in the United States floated or sank. What a condition for her to be in! Made exclusive by the instincts of even the shadowy Churchmanship they possessed, and yet having thrown away the only decent pretext they could have for withholding access to their pulpits and altars from multitudes who were trying as earnestly as themselves to fill souls with the love of Christ, the ministry brought down upon its unhelmeted head the contemptuous reproach of the excluded preachers and their followers, and did not escape by much more than the breadth of a very fine hair from making itself the laughing-stock of mankind.

With such a beginning, what was to be the history of the American Catholic Church? It was certain that many years must pass over her head, and many sore trials be encountered, before she would emerge from the shadow of the eclipse. The most sanguine could hardly have designated less than a century as the period of castigation, during which she would struggle upwards into something like soundness in faith, as that should be held by the mass of her members; while he whose mental composition had admitted one grain of despondency would predict for her a career of increasing apostacy, till at length her justly-incensed Lord should pluck her candlestick from its place. The sombre vaticinations of the latter class had, by far, the most probability upon their side, and would, perhaps, have been fulfilled but for one circumstance which was overlooked. The Americans spoke that grand old tongue, in which were enshrined some of the noblest theological productions that have ever been given to the world, and so could not avoid sometimes stumbling upon a treatise which

would put before them, with extraordinary clearness, and almost irresistible cogency of reasoning, orthodox views to which they had long been strangers. Had they been obliged to draw their divinity entirely from their own doctors, or depend upon the meagre and turbid rills afforded by translators, there could hardly have arisen a John Henry Hobart, to wear upon his noble brows the mitre of the Empire State, and become the champion of American Catholicity, and it is little less than certain that the "Protestant Episcopal" Church would long since have ceased to have so much as a name on the earth.

She still lives and breathes, and can look back over a hundred years of substantial progress, but what position does she occupy in the land? The tear trickles down the watchman's furrowed cheek as he prepares himself to answer the question. She has at least the nominal adherence, and we hope something far beyond that, of a fair proportion of the ablest and best educated men the country can boast, especially perhaps among those whose training in the legal system which we have inherited from our Anglo-Saxon progenitors has peculiarly fitted them for appreciating a theology of precedents; and in the large cities can point to a proud array of graceful spires and solid towers; and that is nearly all that can be pleaded in her behalf. Further than this, we have only to say that her exclusiveness has exposed her to a hatred which is intensified by contempt for the timidity with which it is maintained. She is considered on all sides a fair mark for the shafts of ridicule. The abhorred epithet of *Catholic* is hurled at her by millions, who can only escape the charge of preferring a slanderous accusation by taking refuge behind a gross and culpable ignorance. Her utmost efforts certainly fail to keep her much more than abreast of the increase of population, the ranks of her ministry being filled up with extreme difficulty, and then only partially, and her coffers being chronically empty. In fine, her general condition is such that those who have her welfare at heart periodically wail over the sad state into which she has fallen, and cry aloud to her God to lift her out of it.

Having persevered so long in striving to reduce herself to the status of a sect, without propitiating in the least degree the numerous denominations among whom she would gladly hide her insignificance, is it not almost time that she should try a change of policy? She may move about with deprecatory air for the next

thousand years, if the world last so long, and not make the slightest advance towards a good understanding with those charitable persons who are so ready to fling in her face the term *Catholic*. When she has compelled the Romanists to retract the sweeping condemnation which they pronounced upon her as a mere Protestant sect, at about the same date she will prevail upon the denominations not to class her with the Papists. Why would it not be well for her to see, in the meantime, whether her opponents do not take a more correct view of her true position than she does herself? Is she not as radically distinct from the sects, by reason of not having lost the continuity of her corporate existence, as she is from the Roman Catholics, by having discarded the errors and corruptions in which they remain entangled? Either she is this, or she is nothing, if not worse than nothing. She has long been attempting to persuade men that is she something else, and has only succeeded in getting herself injured, insulted, assailed on every side. What if she should now unfurl her banner and raise the trumpet to her lips, warning men that they must stand aside from her path or abide the consequences, for she has an errand from God to His perishing creatures! Suppose that the tongue, which has hitherto stammered and muttered, should proclaim its message with the clarion tones proper to a herald of salvation! Could the adversaries hate her more bitterly, or attack her more fiercely, than they do now? Would she not put new heart into all her true children, and give to each arm among her chosen warriors the strength of fifty?

If Pearson, Bull, and Waterland are to be the theologians at whose feet the aroused Church of America will sit, let Southey be the poet who shall refresh her in the hour of repose. Let her learn from him who burned beneath Kehama's cruel curse how to resign herself to the terrible trials which beset her; let her encourage herself by Thalaba's example to throw away every dependence but that upon the Lord God of Hosts, who is sworn to succor those who have unwavering faith in His mercy and power; and let her, with Roderick, the glorious Goth, repent in dust and ashes of the sins which have involved her past in guilt and shame; and then, perhaps, will her banners float some memorable day over a field as triumphant as that which witnessed the prodigies of valor enacted by the bare-headed king upon Moor and renegade, when he rode, rejoicing in his strength,

through the serried ranks of the miscreants. If she is not the Church of God, let her speedily perish upon the gibbet of public scorn; but, if she is the duly-accredited representative, in these United States, of the grand old Church of the Ages, she has only to be true to herself, and she will soon fly upon the wings of the Great Eagle to certain victory. May God hasten the consummation!

NOTE TO PAGE 286.

The Creed recited at the Council of Ephesus, and confirmed by the assembled fathers, seems enveloped in no little uncertainty. Although the Council of Constantinople issued a Creed which was different in some respects from that which had been set forth by the earlier gathering, the latter did not at all disappear from sight, nor did it cease to be used. What the Council of Ephesus ratified was called by it the *Nicene* Creed, and the question thereupon arises, Did it mean the form as actually set forth at Nicæa or what we may call the *Niceno-Constantinopolitan* formula, which is substantially the same as our present *Nicene Creed*. On this point authorities differ widely. Dr. Waterland affirms that, when the Ephesine divines solemnly ratified the *Nicene Creed*, and forbade any alteration of it or departure from it, they meant precisely what they said, the very confession of faith given the Church by the three hundred and eighteen bishops, in 325 A. D.; while Bishop Browne, in his well-known work on the Articles, and the author of the Annotated Book of Common Prayer, are quite as positive in their assertions that Cyril and his friends actually gave their sanction to the *improved* version, if we may so designate the altered formulary which we owe to the one hundred and fifty fathers who sat under the presidency of Gregory Nazianzen.

While it must be admitted that the matter is not of very grave importance, it may merit a little attention. The two Creeds do not at all conflict with each other, but are entirely in harmony, the main points of variance being that the earlier ends with damnatory clauses which were omitted from the other, and that this latter is more copious in its expressions concerning the Holy Ghost. Neither, probably, was very new, the original Nicene formula differing little, we have good reason to suppose, from one or more creeds which were recited by individual members of that venerable assemblage when called upon for a declaration of their belief; and the Constantinopolitan being virtually the same thing, retouched by the skillful hand of Gregory Nazianzen,—according, at least, to a wide-spread opinion of antiquity,—he, however, borrowing the alterations from another ancient formulary ante-dating Nicæa, of which Epiphanius gives us information. After Constantinople, the two Creeds moved along, side by side, in sisterly amity, for at least three hundred years, as we know from the most reliable testimony, the records of the Fourth and Sixth General Councils, at both of which the two Creeds were separately sanctioned. The Acts of these Councils mention first the definition of faith set forth by the three hundred and eighteen Holy Fathers of the Church at Nicæa, reäffirming it; and then mention separately the definition of faith set forth by the one hundred and fifty Holy Fathers of the Church at Constantinople, similarly sanctioning it.

Nevertheless, it would be rather satisfactory to find that the General Council which immediately followed Constantinople distinctly recognized the validity of its action upon the important topic of a Creed for the whole Church. We will, first, try to ascertain the fact, and then we may enlarge briefly upon that fact. The learned Hammond, in his very valuable "Definitions of Faith and Canons of the Universal Church," thus translates a portion of the Seventh Canon of the Ephesine Council: "These things having been read, the holy Synod has determined that no person shall be allowed to bring forward, or to write, or to compose any other Creed besides that which was settled by the holy Fathers who were assembled in the city of Nicæa, with the Holy Ghost." This language seems sufficiently explicit to convince any one that the particular Creed adopted by the Third General Council was the Nicene, properly so called, and not the Constantinopolitan. An examination of Beveridge's Synodicon, in which will be seen all the Canons of this Synod, in Latin, will show that Hammond gives a correct version of the important Seventh Canon, unless Beveridge is wrong too. If this is not enough, the investigator may turn to the Arabic Paraphrase which Beveridge annexes; and, if he hesitates to undertake unpointed Arabic, in bad type, a glance at the Latin intercolumnar translation will probably satisfy him that it lends no aid nor comfort to those who insist that *Nicene* means *Constantinopolitan.* And now, when we have turned to Labbe's prodigious work on the Councils, the end is reached. Behold, spread before us on huge folio pages, the proceedings, and the canons, and the letters, and all that is extant done by or at that council, or in relation to it. In Greek and Latin, Labbe gives the same account that Beveridge and Hammond do. There is no allusion to the Constantinopolitan assemblage and its definition of faith, but we are told of the Creed given forth "by the holy Fathers who were assembled in the city of Nicæa." Let us listen to a comment which Labbe quotes from Binius: "After these things the decree of the catholic faith was confirmed. For, the Nicene Symbol having been repeated, it was enjoined, under anathema, that no one should attempt in any way to add to the faith, beyond what had been defined by the Nicene Council." If the indulgent reader will pardon this rude translation, he will judge that Binius and Labbe clearly distinguish *Nicene* from *Niceno-Constantinopolitan.* It will be well, also, that we should notice a long Epistle of Cyril to Anastasius and others, given by Labbe, explaining the *Nicene Creed;* for in it he not only employs the title, but sets down the FORMULA itself at length,—*and the words are those of the original Council.*

We must, therefore, conclude that, unless other evidence can be adduced, we have no good reason to doubt that the Third General Council sanctioned the Creed of the First, and not that of the Second. Moreover, whence such evidence is to be derived is hard to conjecture; and on what grounds Harold Browne and Blunt base their opinions is also very obscure. Waterland's judgment seldom misled him, nor does this seem to be an exceptional instance.

It will, however, be appropriate to reflect that, even at the summer solstice, a day has no more than its twenty-four hours, and that when a council attempts to crowd everything into so brief a space of time, omissions are sure to occur. These dignified prelates, being in such unseemly haste to transact all their business before the arrival of the Antiochene party, doubtless contented themselves with one Creed, which happened to seem to them the best for their purposes, and disregarded the other without intending to deny or disparage it at all. Fairness also reminds us that, twenty years later, not long enough for men to

have forgotten what occurred at this synod, another General Council, that of Chalcedon, confirmed the three that had gone before, and adopted distinctly both Creeds. How Chalcedon could have given its approval to both Constantinople and Ephesus, if Ephesus had intended to repudiate Constantinople, we do not see, especially when we remember that Theodoret attended both assemblies, a man who was quick to discover, and not slow to point out, such contradictions. The Second of Constantinople next lends, in its turn, its solemn sanction to the four that had gone before it, and lastly, the Third of Constantinople, which was the Sixth General Council, sanctions and approves the whole five.

Therefore, although there is *no evidence*, apparently, that the Council of Ephesus even knew that the Constantinopolitan Creed existed, it may nevertheless have even recited that formula, as some suppose, and stamped it with its deliberate approval; and if it did not do so, but ignored it entirely, this was probably due to great haste, for if the action had been intentional, the Council of Chalcedon, knowing this, would have shrunk from stultifying itself by approving the two councils.

As regards the further history of the Creeds, when the decay of Arianism had removed the occasion for reciting the damnatory clauses of the earlier Definition, they were no longer clung to with the old tenacity, and then, the Creed to which they belonged having lost its claim upon a separate existence, the final merging took place, and the Niceno-Constantinopolitan formulary reigned undisputed.

BRITTLE DO NOT
PHOTOCOPY

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
0315024334